School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1419217

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

ST. MICHAEL.

F
864
F573
R3

THE

MISSIONS AND MISSIONARIES

OF

CALIFORNIA

BY

FR. ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT, O. F. M. 1851-1934

VOL. III. UPPER CALIFORNIA

PART II. GENERAL HISTORY

With Numerous Illustrations and Fac-Similes

"Primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat; deinde ne quid veri non audeat." Leo XIII., Epist. Aug. 18, 1883.

"Solo he de ser parcial de la verdad." Fr. Lasuén, "Respuesta" No. 11.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
THE JAMES H. BARRY COMPANY
1913

Nihil Obstat

FR. THEOPHILUS RICHARDT, O. F. M.,
Sacr. Theol. Lector
Censor deputatus

Nihil Obstat

FR. CONRADINUS WALLBRAUN, O. F. M.,
Sacr. Theol. Lector
Censor deputatus

Imprimi Potest

FR. BENEDICTUS SCHMIDT, O. F. M.,
Minister Provincialis
Die 15 Junii, 1912

Imprimatur

✠ PATRITIUS GULIELMUS RIORDAN,
Archiepiscopus Sancti Francisci, Cal.
Die 8 Julii, 1912

COPYRIGHT, 1913
BY
ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT

TO

ST. MICHAEL,

THE ARCHANGEL

CONTENTS

Section I.

CHAPTER I.

Page

A Comisario-Prefecto for the Missions.—Relations with the Fr. Presidente.—The First Comisario.—His Fine Pastoral.—Urges Learning the Indian Language.—Solicitude for the Whites.—Fr. Payéras Succeeds Fr. Señan as Presidente.—Death of Governor Arrillaga.—His Testament.—His Character.—Arrival of Gov. Solá.—"Interrogatorio" on the Missions.—Treachery of the Indians.—Fr. Quintána's Awful Death and His Vindication.—Año de los Temblores.—Effects of the Mexican Rebellion in California.—The Troops Entirely Supported by the Missions.—Willingness of the Fathers.—Foreign Trade Prohibited. 3

CHAPTER II.

Zeal of the Friars.—Fr. Juan Cabot's Expedition.—Fr. Martínez's Expedition.—Soldiers Necessary as Guards.—Expedition to the Sacramento.—Fr. Payéras's Appeal.—Mortality at San Francisco.—Various Causes.—Founding of Mission San Rafael.—Disaster at San Buenaventura.—More Runaways.—The Causes.—Fr. Payéras's Warning.—Fr. Martínez's Statement.—Gov. Solá Worried.—He takes Action.—Various Expeditions.—The Mojaves Revenge Themselves.—Fr. Nuez's Diary.—Solá's Regulations to the Corporals. . . . 22

CHAPTER III.

Fr. Sarriá's Circular.—Evangelical Poverty to Be Observed.—Learning the Language.—Other Exhortations.—Fr. Bestard Orders Biographical Sketches.—Another Circular of Fr. Sarriá.—Handling of Money.—Scarcity of Missionaries.—Gov. Solá's Beautiful Appeal in Behalf of the Friars.—San Fernan-

Page

do College Offers to Cede Some Missions.—Orizaba College Accepts.—Missions Surrendered.—The Friars Displeased with the Choice.—Fr. Payéras Reelected.—No Money for Traveling Expenses.—The College Offers to Cede the Missions to the Bishop.—Vote of the Friars on the Missions to Be Ceded. Orizaba College Withdraws. 41

CHAPTER IV.

South American Rebels Invade California.—Patriotism of the Friars.—Fr. Martínez's Enthusiasm.—Solá's Report to the Viceroy.—The Viceroyal Government Awakens.—Wretched Re-enforcements.—Solá Distracted.—Lodges "Chólos" in Mission San Carlos.—Fr. Sarriá's Grief.—Viceroy Venadito Reproaches the Settlers.—The Missions the Mainstay.—Their Contributions.—Fr. Martínez Surprises the Governor.—Solá Sends an Agent to Mexico.—Fr. Guardian López's Urgent Appeal. 58

CHAPTER V.

Fr. Payéras's Encouraging Circular.—Zealous Disposition of the Friars.—Mission Statistics.—Mission Products.—Insolence of the Soldiers.—Helplessness of the Missionaries and Their Neophytes.—Kotzebue and Russians at San Francisco. —His Strictures.—Fr. Payéras Elected Comisario-Prefecto. —Fr. Cortés's News.—Fr. Guardian's Circular.—His Commands Regarding "Carriages."—The Question Ventilated.— Fr. Payéras's Sensible Decision. 77

CHAPTER VI.

Happenings in Mexico.—The Spanish Córtes.—Its Political Divisions.—Secularization Decree.—Leyes de la Reforma.— King Ferdinand VII. Signs for Fear of Death.—Effect in Mexico.—How the Franciscans in Mexico and California Received the News.—The Fr. Guardian's Instructions.—Fr. Payéras Informs Gov. Solá and the Bishop.—Fr. Payéras's Beautiful Circular.—Gov. Solá to Fr. Payéras.—Bishop Bernardo to Fr. Payéras.—Fr. Sánchez's Sentiments.—Constitution to be Promulgated.—Fr. Señan's Instructions.—Fr. Martínez on the Catecismo Político. 93

CHAPTER VII.

Page

Mexico Independent.—Religious Orders in Mexico.—The Situation at the College.—Solá Turns Against the Fathers.—His Strange Demands.—Fr. Payéras Appeals to the College.—He Explains the Position of the Missionaries.—Their Work and Sacrifices for the Indians—Their Sacrifices for the Troops.—Funds of the Missions.—Why the Fathers Continued in Charge.—Their Sincerity.—Bancroft's Insincerity.—Solá Excused. 108

CHAPTER VIII.

The Missions Supporting the Military.—Fr. Payéras's Circulars.—Fr. Cortés Vainly Tries to Cash Drafts.—Fathers Catalá and Viader Remonstrate.—Contributions of Santa Clara.—Demand of the Comandante of San Diego.—Fr. Gil's Touching Appeal.—The California Settlers and Their Characteristics.—Dramshops at Santa Barbara.—Missions Exempt from Taxation.—Governor Solá.—Insists on Taxing the Neophytes.—Spanish Laws Concerning Indian Converts.—Practice of Spanish Monarchs.—Solá's High-handed Commands.—Injustice of His Proceedings. 123

CHAPTER IX.

Zeal of the Fathers.—Expedition of Fathers Payéras and Sánchez.—Expedition of Captain Luis Argüello.—Fr. Ordaz its Chronicler.—The Regency in Mexico.—Council at Monterey.—Oath of Allegiance.—First General Election.—Solá Elected Delegate to Mexico.—Arrival of Comisionado Fernández.—Council at Monterey.—Fernández's Five Propositions.—Fernández and Fr. Payéras Visit the Russian Fort.—Expedition Described.—Election of the First Legislature.—Luis Argüello Elected Temporary Governor.—Fr. Payéras to Emperor Iturbide.—Fernández and Solá Depart.—Iturbide Deposed and Shot.—Bancroft on Solá. 142

CHAPTER X.

Forfeiture of a Privilege.—Decision of the Bishops of Mexico.—Discouraging Letter of the Fr. Guardian.—The Missions Contribute as Before.—Fr. Payéras Counsels Submission.—More Contributions Demanded.—Indolent Troops.—Disgust of the Fathers.—First Legislature Imposes Taxes.—Prohib-

Page

ited Books.—Argüello's Proclamation.—Books Destroyed.—Reasons Therefor.—Death of Fr. Payéras.—Bancroft's Lavish Praise.—Death of Fr. Señan.—Bancroft's View.—Fr. Señan to Have Been Historian. 162

CHAPTER XI.

Fr. Altimira's Intrigues.—A Usurping Deputation.—Missions to be Suppressed.—Fr. Altimira Founds a New Mission.—Amazement of the Fr. Presidente.—Fr. Altimira Proceeds with the Buildings.—Receives Fr. Sarriá's Letter.—His Wrath.—Fr. Sarriá Lays Down the Law to Argüello.—Compromise.—San Francisco and San Rafael Saved.—Fr. Altimira not Happy.—The First Legislature in Second Session.—Imposes Taxes.—Discriminates Against the Indians.—Fr. Abella's Protest.—Fr. Sarriá's Firm Stand.—Intolerable Oppression.—Kotzebue and Estudillo.—Fr. Sarriá Enlightens Argüello.—Sad State of the Missions.—Fr. Sarriá Warns the Governor. 175

CHAPTER XII.

Indian Revolt.—Immediate Cause.—Happenings at Santa Inés and Purisima.—Revolt Spreads to Santa Barbara.—Fr. Ripoll.—The Soldiers Attack the Indians.—Indians Retreat.—Brutality of the Soldiers.—Governor Sends Troops to Purisima.—Execution of Some Indians.—Santa Barbara Indians Flee to the Tulares.—Efforts to Bring Them Back.—Fr. Ripoll Distracted.—Fr. Sarriá Offers to Persuade Them.—Succeeds.—Change of Superiors in Mexico and California.—Junta de Fomento.—Minister Alaman to Fr. Guardian.—"God and Liberty."—Fr. Guardian's Reply to Alaman. . 194

CHAPTER XIII.

New Mexican Constitution.—Oath Demanded.—Fr. Sarriá Refuses.—The Legislators Meet.—They Take the Oath.—Fr. Esténaga's Action.—Proposition of the Legislators.—Argüello's Decision.—Fr. Sarriá Justifies His Refusal to Fr. Durán and Argüello.—Fr. Tápis to Fr. Durán.—Action of the Mexican President Concerning Fr. Sarriá.—Fr. Durán Changes His Mind.—Demands for Supplies Continue.—Fr. Durán Angers Comandante Martínez.—Fr. Viader Unterrified.—Arrival of Gov. Echeandía.—Wants to Reform Things.

Page

His Absurd Report.—Fr. Arroyo to Herrera.—Numerous Baptisms.—Correspondence of Fr. Ibárra with De la Guerra and Carrillo.—Situation at Mission San Fernando. . . 214

CHAPTER XIV.

Fr. Ibárra's Plain Language Concerning the Soldiers.—Indignant Fr. Martínez Takes Steps to Protect Himself.—Hittell's Misrepresentation.—Alvarado's Silly Story.—Fr. Martínez Caustic.—Intolerable Conditions.—Fr. Peiri Disgusted.—Echeandía Equalizes Mission Taxes.—His Sentiments Regarding the Missionaries.—Missions Mulcted.—Cause of Military Destitution.—Oath of Allegiance.—Mission Lands Coveted.—Echeandía Emancipates Some Indians.—Results.—Missions Decay.—Echeandía Orders Schools Opened. . . 229

CHAPTER XV.

The Franciscans and the Oath of Allegiance.—Fr. Sarriá's Circular.—Fr. Sarriá to Be Banished.—Absurd Charges Against Fr. Martínez.—Some Stipends Paid.—Fr. José Sánchez Appointed Presidente.—His Consternation.—Fr. Durán Consoles Him.—Politics in California.—Politicians in Mexico.—California a Penal Colony.—Sensational Flight of Fathers Ripoll and Altimira.—Unfounded Charges. 243

CHAPTER XVI.

Spying on Missionaries.—Result.—The Friars Necessary for the Welfare of the Territory.—Beechey's Opinion.—Fr. Martínez Asks and Receives Passport.—Numerous Conversions.—Beechey's Description of Mission Methods.—Mexico Decrees Expulsion of All Spaniards.—The College of San Fernando on Verge of Extinction.—Fr. Arreguín.—Mission Funds.—The Fathers Refuse to Swear Allegiance.—Echeandía's Excuse for Inaction.—List of Missionaries and Their Condition.—Echeandía Pleads for Them.—Another Decree of Expulsion.—Action of the Town Councils of San José and Monterey.—Fathers Demand Their Passports. 259

CHAPTER XVII.

Fr. Luis Martínez.—Offends Echeandía and the Paisanos.—The Solís Revolt.—"Bravery" of the Paisanos.—Bancroft on Fr. Martínez.—Echeandía in Search of a Pretext.—Fr. Martínez

Page

Arrested.—Imprisoned.—Echeandía's Motives.—Fr. Sarriá's Defense of Fr. Martínez.—Sad State of the Missions.—Echeandía's Hypocrisy.—His Impertinence.—Rebuked.—Shameless Treatment of Fr. Martínez.—Mrs. Ord's Narrative. 280

CHAPTER XVIII.
(Continued.)

Echeandía Tries to Find Evidence Against Fr. Martínez.—Letters of Fathers Juan and Pedro Cabot.—Fr. Martínez's Defence and Protest.—A Farcical Court-Martial.—Officers Composing the Court.—Echeandía's Instructions.—Fr. Martínez Banished.—Vallejo's Calumnies.—Attitude of the Missionaries.—The Indians.—Revolt in the North.—Change of Presidente of the Missions. 295

Section II.

CHAPTER I.

A Summary.—Position of the Missionary Fathers in California.—They Pacify the Savages and Secure the Territory.—Wanted no Compensation but Freedom of Action.—They Support the Territorial Government and Troops.—Indebtedness of the Californians to the Missions.—Ingratitude of the Paisanos.—Their Religious Indifference.—Fr. Viader's Complaint.—Motive of the Paisano Hostility.—Echeandía Proposes the Confiscation of the Mission Property.—Meaning of the Decree of 1813.—Real Motive Again.—Echeandía's Plan Adopted by the California Assembly; Rejected in Mexico.—A Ridiculous Project.—Schools.—Why They Failed. . 311

CHAPTER II.

President Bustamante to Fr. Durán.—Reply.—The Missionaries Illtreated.—Indians Oppressed by the Troops.—Insecurity of the Territory.—Missionaries Threatened.—Fr. Martínez Shamelessly Arrested at San Luis Obispo.—Outrageously Treated at Santa Barbara.—Farcical Court-Martial.—Echeandía's Despotism.—Missionaries Falsely Accused.—Appeal for Protection to the President.—Another Letter from Bustamante.—Lengthy Reply.—Stipends not Wanted Unless the Troops Are First Paid.—Neophytes Still Backward.—A Way out of the Difficulty.—Commerce.—Propositions.—Good Will of the Bustamante Administration. 328

CHAPTER III.

Page

Echeandía Removed.—Manuel Victoria Appointed.—Echeandía's Trickery.—He Proclaims the "Secularization" of the Missions.—Bancroft on the Young Californians and on Echeandía's Action.—Efforts of the Californians to Seduce the Indians.—Bancroft on Echeandía's Scheme.—Victoria Revokes Echeandía's Decree.—Victoria and Padrés.—Victoria Exonerates the Missionaries.—Religious Principles of the Young Californians.—Victoria Accuses Padrés of Treason.—Rage of Padrés and His Young Partisans.—Victoria Endeavors to Restore Order.—Sends Padrés out of the Country.—Hittell and Bancroft on Gov. Victoria. 346

CHAPTER IV.

Real Motive of Opposition to Victoria.—Pronunciamento of the Conspirators.—Victoria Goes to Meet Them.—His Imprudence.—His Fearlessness.—Dangerously Wounded.—Resigns and Departs.—Echeandía Again.—The Legislative Assembly.—Three Governors at Once, then Two.—Two Memorials.—Grandiloquent Vallejo.—The Bustamante Administration.—Views of the Missionaries Demanded.—Replies of Fathers Cabot, Jimeno, and Sánchez.—Fr. Sarriá's Letter.—Bancroft on Fr. Durán's Commentaries. 361

CHAPTER V.

Fr. Durán's Magnificent Exposure of the Confiscation Scheme.—Neophytes in the Position of Children Under Age.—Echeandía Misconstrues Law of September 13th, 1813.—Failure of Emancipation.—Neophytes Not Forced into Subjection; Not Discontented.—Missionaries Loyal.—Law of September 1813 Abused.—Indians Not Freed.—Unjust Distribution of Lands in Spite of Law of January 4th, 1813.—Neophytes Robbed.—At the Mercy of Speculators. . . 379

CHAPTER VI.

(Fr. Durán's Notes Continued.)

Disregard for the Law of 1813.—Indians Overtaxed.—Salaried Officials to Replace Unsalaried Missionaries.—Indians Burdened to Ease White People.—Indians the Packmules and Scapegoats.—Talk of Schools Mere Claptrap.—Epilogue.—Real Aims of the Mission Enemies.—Victoria Defender of Indian Rights and Property. 391

CHAPTER VII.

Page

Carlos Carrillo's Splendid Address before the Mexican Congress in Behalf of the Missions and the Mission Fund.—Results.—Nativism.—Mexican Friars from Zacatecas Go to California.—Authority of the Leader of the Missionary Band.—He Administers Confirmation.—Return to Mexico.—Fr. Durán Sends Fr. Peiri to Mexico.—Object.—Fr. Peiri's Noble Character.—Calumnies of the Pico Clique.—Forbes on Fr. Peiri.—Two Governors in California.—Echeandía's Last Attempt.—Replies of Fathers Martin, Oliva, Zalvidea, and Ánzar. . 403

CHAPTER VIII.

The Mission System.—Wealth of the Missions the Result.—Indian Liberty.—The Friars not Parish Priests.—Filial Subjection not Slavery.—A Generous Proposition.—The Friars Will not Stultify Themselves to Aid Echeandía.—Neophytes Seduced by Echeandía.—Neophytes not Slaves.—False Charges of the Ex-Governor.—The Key to Echeandía's Misrepresentations.—Neophytes Regarded as Children or Apprentices.—Consequences of Echeandía's Machinations.—The Friars and the Temporalities.—Willing to Surrender Them to Lawful Authority.—Conclusion. 422

CHAPTER IX.

New Governor.—Zacatecan Franciscans for California.—Mutiny.—Fr. García Diego to Figueroa.—The New Governor Arrives at Monterey.—Death of Fr. José Sánchez.—Fr. Durán Complains to Figueroa.—Distribution of the Friars.—Fr. García Diego's Circular on Flogging.—Fr. Gutiérrez on the Same Subject.—Vallejo Complains of the Zacatecan Friars.—Replies of Fr. García Diego and Fr. Rúbio.—Vallejo Slanders Fr. Mercado.—The Latter Suspended.—Investigation.—Fr. Mercado Declared Innocent.—Vallejo Himself Accused. . 442

CHAPTER X.

Changes at San Fernando College.—Fr. Durán Vice-Prefecto.—Death and Departure of Some Missionaries.—Gov. Figueroa.—Echeandía's Special Pleading.—Minister Alamán Repudiates Echeandía's Decree.—Figueroa's General Instructions.—He Is not Friendly.—California Rid of Echeandía.—Figueroa's Colored Report.—His Emancipation Reglamento.

Page

—Bandini's Scheme.—Fr. Durán's Distressing Report.—Emancipated Indians Veritable Slaves.—His Second Report.—His Reflections on the Reglamento.—His Circular.—The Friars not Absolute Masters. 464

CHAPTER XI.

Failure of Figueroa's Scheme.—Vallejo Applauds the Governor.—The Reasons.—Figueroa Turns to the Two Superiors for Advice.—Reply of Fr. García Diego.—Shows Impracticability and Dangers of Secularization.—Fr. Durán's Exhaustive Statement.—Missions "Ready" under the Law.—Difficulties and Dangers.—How It Might Be Accomplished.—First to Propose Appointment of a Bishop.—Figueroa Reports Adversely.—Shows the Injustice of the Measure before the Mexican Congress. 483

CHAPTER XII.

Secularization before the Mexican Congress.—What Led to it.—Elections in California.—Juan Bandini Goes to Congress.—Legislature Meets at Monterey.—Figueroa's Pompous Address.—Proposes Plan against the Missions.—A Colonization Swindle.—Bandini Joins the Schemers.—Colonists Collected. Compañia Cosmopolitana.—Híjar and Padrés Demand Possession of the Missions.—Baffled.—Hijar's Instructions.—The Legislature Rejects His Demands.—Colony Goes to Pieces.—Bandini Disappointed.—His Smuggling Operations.—Deposed and Disgraced. 501

CHAPTER XIII.

Decree against Monks and Nuns.—Stupid Ignorance of the Authors.—Fr. Durán's Expressive Note.—The Mexican Congress Enacts a Secularization Decree.—Not Satisfactory to the Californians.—The Reason.—Spirit of the Mexican Government.—Assault on the Pious Fund.—Another Secularization Decree.—Figueroa and the Californians.—Trick of the Governor.—His Own "Secularization" Project.—Satisfactory to the Californians.—Adopted.—Text of the Decree.—A Supplementary Decree. 515

CHAPTER XIV.

Page

Hittell on the Act of Confiscation.—San Carlos Inventory.—How the Legislators Provided for Themselves.—Rich Harvest for the Administrators.—Portilla's Lament.—Neophytes Obstreperous.—Fr. Durán on Missions San Luis Rey and San Juan Capistrano.—Dana on the Result of the Confiscation.—How the Missionaries Bore Themselves.—Fr. Durán Hurt at Their Silence.—His Instructions.—The Friars Absolutely Detached and Disinterested.—Fr. Durán's Confidential Circular.—Satisfaction of the Friars.—Eager to Be Relieved.—Action of the Fr. Guardian of Guadalupe, Zacatecas. . . 533

CHAPTER XV.

The Old Story.—Missions Must Furnish Supplies As Ever.—Figueroa to Fr. Durán.—Specimen Demands.—Slanders of the Paisano Chiefs.—Vallejo's Absurd Charges.—Claim of Wholesale Slaughter.—Fathers Disheartened.—Pico's Suppression of Real Reason for the Decay.—Some Stipends for the Friars.—The Pious Fund.—How the Government Misused It.—Figueroa's Ungracious Recommendations.—His Report.—His Fanaticism.—The Majority of the People with the Friars. 553

CHAPTER XVI.

Departure of Fr. Juan Cabot.—Death of Fathers Uría and Sarriá.—Bancroft on Fr. Sarriá.—Manufacture of Wine.—An Amusing Episode.—Fr. Durán's Indignation.—Fr. Blas Ordáz Involved.—Fr. Blas Astray.—Explanation.—Politicians to Blame.—Fr. García Diego's Petition.—Humiliation of the Missionaries.—Figueroa and Divine Worship.—Result of the Comisionado System.—Fr. Quijas's Terrible Indictment of Mariano Vallejo and Henchman Antonio Ortega.—Shocking State of Things at Mission San Francisco Solano. . . 567

CHAPTER XVII.

Why Vallejo and Ortega Went Unpunished.—A Sample of Vallejo's Ungovernable Vanity and Audacious Falsehoods.—Fr. García Diego Protests Against Official Arrogance.—Beneficiaries of Mission Confiscation.—Los Angeles as Capital of California.—Elections.—Last Address of Figueroa.—

Page

signs.—His Last Will.—His Death and Funeral.—Resolutions of the Territorial Assembly.—What the Result Was.—Figueroa's Burial at Santa Barbara.—Fr. García Diego's Statement.—He Journeys to Mexico. 590

APPENDIX.

A.—Necessity of Learning the Language of the Indians . . 607
B.—Religious Instruction for the Settlers 611
C.—Religious Orders and Their Enemies 616
D.—La Bula de la Santa Cruzada 620
E.—The Spanish Inquisition 623
F.—Wealth of the Missions 629
G.—Land Grants during the Mission Period 638
H.—Memorias del Rey 647
I.—Very Rev. Alexis Bachelot and Rev. Patrick Short . . 650
J.—State of the Missions on December 31st, 1832 . . . 653
K.—Alleged Wanton Slaughter of Cattle 654

ILLUSTRATIONS

Page

St. Michael, the Archangel, Special Patron of Franciscan Missionary Colleges . . . . . Frontispiece
Seal of the Commissary-Prefect of Mexico 2
Signature of Fr. Vicente Francisco de Sarriá 5
Signature of Fr. Florencio Ibañez 8
Signature of Fr. Francisco Pujól 11
Signature of Fr. Andrés Quintana 15
Signature of Governor José Darío Argüello 18
Signature of Fr. Juan Cabot 24
Signature of Fr. Luis Gil y Taboáda 30
Mission San Rafael Archangel. Drawing by Alexander Harmer 32
Signature of Fr. Joaquín Páscual Nuez 39
Signature of Fr. Commissary-General Juan Buenaventura Bestard 45
Signature of Governor Pablo Vicente de Solá 50
Signature of Fr. Luis Antonio Martínez 60
Signature of Viceroy Francisco Venegas 62
Grinding Corn in the Mortar and Crushing Soft Corn on the Metáte. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 65
Tabular Biennial Report for the Years 1809-1810.—The first column notes the missions existing at the time. The other columns in succession give the number of priests at each mission, the aid received from the royal treasury, which was nothing, aid from the Pious Fund for the two missionaries, total aid, number of male, number of female Indians, the total Indian population. (Facsimile) 72
Signature of Fr. Baldoméro López 74
Ordinary Conveyance in the Early Days. Original Drawing by Arthur B. Dodge 90
Signature of Fr. Presidente José Señan 105
Signature of Fr. Comisario-Prefecto Mariano Payéras . . 114
Signature of Fr. Magín Catalá 125
Signature of Fr. Francisco Suñer 132
Church of San Fernando de Mexico. From an old Lithograph 136
Signature of Fr. Presidente José Bernardo Sánchez . . 144
Signature of Fr. Jaime Escudé 149
Signature of Rev. Augustín Fernández de San Vicente . . 153
Signature of Fr. Augustín Garíjo 162

Page

Tabular Annual Report on the Spiritual State of the Missions for the Year 1821.—The first column gives the names and date of founding. In succession the seven columns show the number of Baptisms of adults, children, children of recent converts, Baptisms of gentiles, of whites, of children of old Indian Christians, and total Baptisms. Columns 9 and 10 report the Marriages of Indian and white couples. Columns 11 and 12 indicate the number of Deaths of Indians and settlers. Columns 13 and 14 have the number of male and female Indians at the respective mission. Column 15 reports the total Indian population. (Facsimile) 172

Mission San Francisco Solano. Drawing by A. Harmer . . 177

Signature of Fr. José Altimira 181

Signature of Fr. Ramón Abélla 186

Signature of Fr. Francisco Xavier Uría 195

Battle at Mission Santa Barbara. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 198

Signature of Fr. Antonio Jayme 200

Soldiers Murdering an Indian. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 202

Signature of Fr. Antonio Rodríguez 203

Signature of Fr. Antonio Ripoll 206

Signature of Fr. Tomás Esténaga 215

Signature of Fr. Felipe Arroyo de la Cuesta 226

Signature of Fr. Francisco González de Ibárra 231

Signature of Fr. Juan Calzáda 248

Coming from Church, Santa Barbara. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 255

Signature of Fr. Gerónimo Boscana 260

Signature of Fr. Ildefonso Arreguín 266

Fr. Pedro Cabot in Sight of the Tulares. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 271

Signature of Fr. José Barona 273

Brutal Arrest of Fr. Luis A. Martínez. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 287

Signature of Fr. Antonio Jiméno 292

Signature of Fr. Pedro Cabot 296

Signature of Fr. José Maria Guzmán 306

Trust in God, Whatever Bad White Men Do. Drawing . . 310

Signature of Fr. José Viadér 317

Interior of the Church of San Fernando de Mexico. From an old Lithograph 320

Signature of Fr. Juan Bautista Sancho 326

Signature of Fr. Presidente Narciso Durán 335

Page
Signature of Governor José M. de Echeandía 348
Alvarado Harangues the Indians of San Miguel. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 352
Portrait of Fr. Antonio Peiri 384
Fr. A. Peiri Blessing His Indians. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 413
Signature of Fr. Fernando Martín 419
Arrival of Governor José Figueroa with the Zacatecan Franciscans. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 446
Signature of Fr. J. Maria Gutiérrez 457
Signature of Fr. J. Maria Vásquez del Mercado . . . 462
Signature of Fr. Vincente Páscual Oliva 480
Missionary College of Our Lady of Guadalupe, Zacatecas . 488
Signature of Governor José Figueroa 499
Indians at San Luis Rey Refuse to Work for Captain Portilla. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 537
Signature of Fr. Buenaventura Fortuni 538
The Remains of Fr. Vicente de Sarriá Taken to Mission San Antonio. Original Drawing by A. Harmer . . . 568
Signature of Fr. Blas Ordáz 575
Signature of Fr. José Lorenzo Quíjas 586
Funeral of Governor José Figueroa. Original Drawing by A. Harmer 603
Signature of Very Rev. Alexis Bachelot 651
Signature of Rev. Patrick Short 651
Annual Report on the Spiritual and Temporal State of the Missions for the Year 1820.—The first column notes the name, date of founding, latitude, and distance from the preceding mission. In succession the other columns report the whole number from the date of founding of Baptisms, Marriages, Deaths, the neophytes at the mission, the number of cattle, sheep, goats, swine, mares with their colts, horses and mules, the number of fanegas sown and harvested that year of wheat, barley, corn, beans, garbanzos, peas, and horsebeans or lentils. (Facsimile) . . . . . End of the volume

SECTION I

FR. VICENTE FRANCISCO DE SARRIÁ
(1812-1818; 1824-1830)

FR. MARIANO PAYÉRAS
(1819-1823)

COMISARIOS-PREFECTOS

FR. JOSÉ SEÑÁN
(1812-1815; 1820-1823)

FR. MARIANO PAYÉRAS
(1815-1820)

FR. NARCISO DURÁN
(1824-1827)

FR. JOSÉ BERNARDO SÁNCHEZ
(1827-1830)

PRESIDENTES

Seal of the Fr. Prefecto in Mexico.

CHAPTER I.

A Comisario-Prefecto for the Missions.—Relations with the Fr. Presidente.—Fr. Vicente de Sarriá First Comisario.—His Fine Pastoral.—Urges Learning the Indian Language.—Solicitude for the Whites.—Fr. Mariano Payéras Succeeds Fr. Señan as Presidente.—Death of Governor Arrillaga.—His Testament.—His Character.—Arrival of Gov. P. V. de Solá.—"Interrogatorio" on the Missions.—Treachery of the Indians.—Fr. Quintána's Awful Death and His Vindication.—Año de los Temblores.—Effects of the Mexican Rebellion in California.—The Troops Entirely Supported by the Missions.—Willingness of the Fathers.—Foreign Trade Prohibited.

AN important innovation was introduced into the ecclesiastical government of the California missions in 1812. Fr. Estévan Tápis early in September, 1810, had petitioned to be relieved of the office of presidente to which he had been three times elected. Fr. Guardian Agustin Garijo[1] promised that his wishes should be considered at the coming chapter. This was held for the election of College officials on July 11th, 1812. Fr. Miguel Lull received the majority of the forty-five votes cast for the office of guardian, and Fathers Juan Calzada, Baldomero López, Juan Torrens, and Juan Cortés were elected discretos or councillors. Fr. Cortés was also made master of novices, and Fr. Pedro Martínez became procurator for the California missions. Fathers López and Cortés had labored in California, and therefore understood the situation there perfectly.[2] On the same occasion Fr. José Señan of Mission San Buenaventura was appointed to succeed Fr. Tápis as presidente.[3] Two

[1] Fr. Garijo to Fr. Tápis, February 20, 1811. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Fr. Garijo was elected guardian in 1809 probably, though we have no record of the chapter held then.

[2] Fr. Pedro Martínez to Fr. Sarriá, July 17th, 1812. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[3] Fr. Lull, "Patente," to Fr. Señan, July 15th, 1812; Fr. Señan, "Circular," December 9th, 1812. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

days later, July 13th, the chapter again convened for the purpose of choosing a comisario-prefecto for California. He was to represent the Fr. Commissary-General of the Indies and to transact the business affairs of the missionaries with the territorial government, whilst the Fr. Presidente attended to the interior or disciplinary matters of the Fathers. Practically, he was a kind of permanent visitor-general, whilst the Fr. Presidente possessed the authority of a commissary-provincial. The comisario-prefecto ranked the Fr. Presidente in matters pertaining to the Indian missions and to the missionaries as religious or friars; but the Fr. Presidente held the position of vicario foraneo of the bishop, and as such was the head of the Church in the territory. In ecclesiastical affairs, then, the Fr. Presidente outranked the Fr. Comisario-Prefecto throughout the missionary period. To avoid confusion this must be borne in mind. Of the fifty votes cast for the office of comisario-prefecto Fr. Vicente de Sarriá received twenty-seven, whilst the remainder were cast for Fr. Señan. The former was accordingly declared elected to the new position.[4]

Although the news of his appointment reached California before the close of the year, Fr. Sarriá waited six months before announcing it officially. Meanwhile he compiled a beautiful and remarkable "Pastoral" which he issued from San Carlos on July 2nd, 1813. On seventeen closely written folio pages, and in forty-eight articles, the new comisario-prefecto exhorts his brethren in the Order to be faithful observers of the seraphic Rule of St. Francis, and by all means to adhere to the practice of the Annual Spiritual Exercises, or the Retreat. He then in eleven articles,[5] as a matter of the highest importance,[6] urges the Fathers to learn the native language, and to teach the Christian doctrine in the idiom of the Indians lest their missionary

[4] Fr. Cortés, "Tabla Capitular," July 28th, 1812; Fr. Juan B. Cévallos, Visitador y Presidente to Fr. Sarriá, "Patente," July 15th, 1812. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[5] From four to fourteen inclusive.

[6] "de la suma importancia y necesidad."

efforts remain fruitless. He directs the attention of the friars to the declaration of enlightened missionaries in the past, to the decisions of Councils and of a General Chapter of the Order, and even to royal decrees. Furthermore Fr. Sarriá quotes the instructions of a former bishop of the diocese, and frankly tells them that the only means to attain the purposes of the missionary establishments is the study of the language of the Indians.[7] In his exhortation he urges the Fathers to compose or perfect catechisms in the dialect of their respective missions, and quotes Pope Benedict XIV. who declared that such catechisms must contain acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, which two of his Constitutions make it obligatory to recite in the vernacular on all Sundays and feast days. Fr. Sarriá then goes on to show how this can best be done at the various missions



Signature of Fr. Vicente Francisco de Sarriá.

with old and young, and insists that the old people, who cannot come to the church, should be instructed in their own language individually at their homes. "This is a burden," the Fr. Comisario concedes, "but we absolutely cannot throw it from us. The duty of pastors is not to look after the strong only, but after the weak and feeble, says St. Francis de Sales quoting St. Bernard." The zealous Father reverts to the subject again and again, and justly declares that the Indian cannot grasp the truths when they are imparted to him in a language not his own.

Articles fifteen to twenty-five deal with the manner of

[7] "que el único medio para lograr los fines de nuestra mision es el estudio de la lengua de los Indios." See appendix A.

leading the neophytes to make their confessions, and he deplores the observation that some missions are backward on this point. Articles twenty-six to thirty-one treat of the holy Communion of the Indians. Fr. Sarriá here quotes the Councils of Mexico and Lima which command that holy Communion should be administered to the neophytes, provided, of course, that they are disposed and capable, especially in their last illness. Particular solicitude is expressed for the sick, for whom he thought it advisable to have a common infirmary. If tenderness were employed, he thought the repugnance of the Indians for such a place might be overcome. The Fr. Comisario then recurs to the duty of instructing the Indians, and reminds the Fathers that the Council of Trent orders sermons on all Sundays and days of obligation for all the people. "In the absence of curates, then," he says, "we do not comply with the duties of our ministry by merely celebrating holy Mass at the presidios without preaching, or at least reading an instruction to those connected with the garrison. In as far as in us lies we must have these white people [8] recite their prayers daily, and we must explain them at times, especially in Lent; we also must induce the people to make their confessions in a proper disposition."[9]

Fr. Sarriá next turns to the subject of the temporal administration of the missions. "This is a necessary task," he continues, "in order to gain our spiritual object; but it must never be taken up with such ardor that it perchance cause us

---

[8] "Gente de Razon" is the term used throughout. For the sake of clearness we usually give the English equivalent.

[9] The exhortation on these points was timely. The white people certainly lacked the necessary religious instruction, otherwise the ignorance of the later Californians in official circles, and their little regard for Religion and morals are incomprehensible. The Fathers had their hands full teaching and guarding the Indians; but it seems something more could have been done to ground the white children in Faith and morals. As it was, it seems the catechism was driven into the children by unsympathetic seculars. The child thus learned to dread the religious instruction which was really no instruction at all. See Appendix B.

to overlook our principal aim. We may err through over great solicitude for even the necessary things, if because of them, against the words of our holy Father St. Francis, we extinguish the spirit of holy prayer and devotion; much more so if for what is superfluous we abuse the time set aside for complying with other obligations, as for instance the study of Moral Theology, and the other sciences necessary for our state and ministry." In conclusion the eminent writer says that he does not intend to accuse any one in particular, but that all these points being essential, it was necessary to speak of them in order that the Fathers may understand what sentiments possess and animate him.[10] Owing to its great length, Fr. Sarriá six days later, July 8th, issued another circular in which he revoked the order of copying the Pastoral into the Libro de Patentes of each mission. In its place he forwarded an "Extracto" of the forty-eight articles which was to be copied, sent from mission to mission, signed by the respective senior missionaries, and returned to the comisario. The Pastoral was merely to be read and returned the same way.[11]

Whilst the term of the comisario-prefecto lasted six years, the Fr. Presidente was appointed for only three years. Even this short term seemed too long for Fr. Señan who loved a retired life without the burdens of office. He therefore importuned the Fr. Guardian to relieve him when his term expired in 1815. His desire was gratified; for the chapter held in July of that year, besides electing a guardian in the person of Fr. Juan Calzada, named Fr. Mariano Payeras of Mission Purisima Concepcion to succeed Fr. Señan. The new presidente, like Fr. Señan, continued to reside at his own mission, whilst the Fr. Comisario-Prefecto had his headquarters at San Carlos.[12]

---

[10] Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," July 2nd, 1813. Libro de Patentes, Mision de Santa Barbara. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[11] Fr. Sarriá, "Extracto," July 8th, 1813. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[12] Fr. Calzada to Fr. Payeras, "Patente," July 24th, 1815. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Fr. Payeras to Gov. Solá, November 22nd, 1815. "Archb. Arch.," no. 427.

In the meantime Governor José Joaquín de Arrillaga died a most edifying death at Mission Soledad at ten o'clock in the evening, July 25th, 1814, after he had received all the Sacraments of the Church. On a tour of inspection he had been seized with a serious illness, and had hastened to put



Signature of Fr. Florencio Ibañez.

himself under the care of his old friend Fr. Florencio Ibañez. At ten o'clock in the morning of July 26th the body was interred in the center of the mission church as he had desired. Arrillaga had never married, but owing to his adherence to his religious principles he had led a clean life throughout. He left in Spain a brother, three married sisters, and one unmarried sister, Maria Josefa. The latter he constituted his chief heir; but though he had been in the service of the king since November 1777 his estate amounted to scarcely three thousand dollars, most of which was due him from various persons. His testament, dated Soledad, July 15th, 1814, begins "In the Name of the Most Holy Trinity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, three distinct Persons and one true God. . . . First, I direct that my lifeless body shall be clothed in the habit which the religious of our Father St. Francis wear, and my tomb shall be in one of the churches where I may die." After enumerating the legacies, among which were small amounts to his Indian servant Antonio and two other attendants, he ordered that his executor, José Maria Estrada, should pay $600 to have six hundred holy Masses offered up for the repose of his soul.[13]

[13] Fr. Sarriá, Certificate, April 8th, 1818. "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Benicia, xxxiii, 498-503; xxxv, 428; xxxviii, 498-500; Prov. Rec. x, 266; Prov. St. Pap. xx, 842-844. For Arrillaga's autograph see vol. i, p. 527.

Such display of faith and piety is most distasteful to Theodore Hittell. The deceased therefore does not fare as well at his hands as justice requires. In mentioning the legacy for the holy Masses Hittell adverts to the fact that José Estrada paid only $599 to Fr. Sarriá, and that "the estate consequently saved a dollar. It might have been better and it would certainly have been pleasanter to record, if the dollar saved had gone to the missionaries and the five hundred and ninety-nine paid out to Doña Maria Josefa."[14] What fanatical hatred against Catholic missionaries! What this writer's description of the missions and missionaries must be can be inferred from the passage just quoted.

On the other hand it is agreeable to note that Bancroft endeavors to treat Arrillaga with fairness, and forgets to sneer at the religious convictions of the late governor. "From the day of his enlistment," he acknowledges, "to his death, no fault was found with his conduct by superiors, by subordinates, or by the friars. As a soldier, officer, and provincial ruler, he obeyed every order and performed every duty with zeal, courage, and good faith; and he did this with so much tact that as a rule he made no enemies. Extremely pious and attached to the missionaries, he yet seems to have escaped the reputation of *frailéro*[15] in its offensive sense. In every station he was a model. . . . In person, the governor was tall, with fair, ruddy skin and blue eyes. In manner he was abrupt at times, but usually courteous and affable; generous to all, cordial and frank in his intercourse with the officers, kind-hearted and witty; popular with the soldiers, who used to call him Papá Arrillaga, but always ready in official transactions to put on that sternness of demeanor so essential from a Spanish point of view to dignity. He was very fond of serving as godfather and groomsman, and no baptism or wedding in the highest circles was deemed altogether complete and satisfactory without his services."[16] Arrillaga was on the best

[14] Hittell, i, 630.

[15] See vol. ii, p. 358.

[16] Bancroft, ii, 204-207.

of terms with the missionaries, as Bancroft intimates; hence it was that the missionaries labored with far more cheerfulness, and the missions progressed more rapidly in every way, than under any of his predecessors. On December 30th, 1809, Fr. Guardian Agustin Garijo acknowledged as much by personally thanking him for his kind treatment of the friars.[17]

Captain José Darío Argüello, comandante of Santa Barbara and senior officer, assumed the temporary government of California, but continued to reside at Santa Barbara. On December 31st, 1814, Viceroy Calleja appointed Lieutenant-Colonel Pablo Vicente de Solá governor of the territory. Captain Argüello on the same date was made governor of Lower California, but retained command until the arrival of Solá at Monterey on August 30th, 1815, after a voyage of seventy-five days.[18]

Meanwhile the Spanish government had given some little evidence of interest in the missions. On October 6th, 1812, Don Ciríaco González Carvajál, Secretary of Foreign Relations, addressed an "Interrogatorio" to the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in the Spanish dominions of America requesting them to lend their aid to obtain from all the missionaries and others replies to thirty-six questions regarding the natives in their pagan state. The topics in their order are as follows: races, their origin, languages, affection for wives, education, agriculture, mechanical arts, affection or aversion toward foreigners, complaints, their remedies, inclination for reading and writing, means to inculcate Spanish, virtues of both sexes, superstitions, catechisms in native idiom, idolatry, moral and political conditions, marriage customs, medical treatment, calendar, food, drink, sun or moon worship, traditions, funeral customs, fidelity to promises, veracity, vices of both sexes, trade and money, harvest customs, whether irascible, chastisements employed by themselves, human sacrifices and their ceremonies, wealthy na-

[17] Fr. Garijo to Arrillaga, "Archb. Arch.," no. 343.

[18] Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," August 31st, 1815; Bancroft, ii, 207-209; Hittell, i, 631-633.

tives, chiefs and caciques, services to one another, fondness for music, instruments, songs, prominent men in the past, ideas of eternity, and dress. The Fathers received this interrogatorio through the Bishop of Sonora. The replies more or less complete of eighteen missions, all except Purisima, are extant. Fr. Presidente José Señan devoted the first seven months of 1815 to compiling a summary from all the reports. It covers sixteen folio pages, and is the most complete description of the Indian and his ways drawn up by any of the friars. Fr. Señan dated his report to the bishop on August 11th, 1815.[20] What the object of the Spanish government was is not clear. Nothing came of it. As the contents of the various replies have already been utilized, or will find a place in the history of the respective missions in a subsequent volume, we need not dwell upon them any further.

While the Fathers sacrificed themselves for the Indians, they received little gratitude from their wards. Nay, at some missions attempts were made upon the lives of the Fathers by neophytes. At San Antonio and San Miguel, for instance, unknown persons tried to poison the missionaries. Fathers Martin and Carnicer of San Miguel recovered, but



Signature of Fr. Francisco Pujol.

Fr. Pujol, who had come from San Antonio shortly before, after suffering terribly, died a few weeks later in February, 1801. There seems to have been no doubt in the minds of the people that his death was the result of poisoning, though no reason could be found for an attempt on the lives

[20] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

of these excellent men.[21] Among the vicious, however, there always were those who would have openly vented their wrath upon the missionaries for interfering with the gratification of carnal desires, had not the presence of the guards checked them. Yet, one of the most zealous Fathers fell a victim to Indian treachery in this very year 1812. On the morning of October 12th the neophytes of Mission Santa Cruz were shocked to learn that their missionary, Fr. Andres Quintana, had been found dead in bed. A superficial investigation was instituted, but as no signs of violence were discovered the verdict was that the Father had died a natural death. About two years later suspicions were aroused and it was learned that a number of neophytes had conspired to put the missionary out of the way. As he was a powerful man physically and fearless withal, they dared not assault him. So they pretended a sick-call while he was ill himself, then waylaid him, and despatched their victim in a most revolting and diabolical manner.[22] An examination of the body confirmed the evidence given at the trial. The murderers offered as their excuse excessive cruelty on the part of the missionary. The conspirators were found guilty and the case was sent to the viceroy for final sentence. In the spring of 1816 the decision arrived. It sentenced five of the criminals to receive two hundred lashes each, and to work in chains from two to ten years. Two other guilty Indians had meanwhile died in prison. Only one is said to have survived his punishment.

This scarcely sufficed to clear the deceased of the stigma of cruelty broached against him by the murderers, particularly as the reviewing judge in Mexico seemed to put some little faith in the charge. Malevolent writers, as well as malevolent Indians, have frequently endeavored to fasten the reproach of cruelty upon the missionaries. Documentary evidence has demonstrated that there was little or no truth in such charges as far as former periods are concerned.

---

[21] Libro de Entierros de la Mision de San Antonio.

[22] Libro de Entierros de la Mision de Santa Cruz.

It is sufficient to quote the following official declaration of the governor to prove that the accusation was also untrue of the Fathers in the second decade of the century. Writing to the viceroy on June 2nd, 1816, Governor Solá expressed himself as follows:

"Most Excellent Sir:—As soon as I received your decision, which was made in accordance with the Auditor of War, regarding the criminal case against the Christian Indians of Mission Santa Cruz, whose names are Lino Antonio, Quiríco, Julian, Ambrosio, Andrés, Leto Antonio, Secundino, and Fulgéncio, for the treacherous and cruel murder of their missionary, Fr. Andrés Quintana, I transmitted it for execution to the comandante of the San Francisco presidio. It has been carried out as I informed Your Excellency on February 5th.

"My attention, Your Excellency, was aroused by an expression of the said Honorable Auditor in favor of the defendants, in addition to the doctrine of Solorzano, and by the reason the Indians set forth for committing the deed. They claim that the Missionary Father had ordered a whip made of iron to punish them. I have examined the said case, and I find in reality that the second witness says that the Father ordered a whip made of iron to beat them. The same is claimed by the culprits Julian and Quirico. The defendant Antonio says that the Father commanded it to be made for the punishment of Quirico. Andrés says that the missionary whipped two so that they almost died. Lino, the son of Andrés, said that the Father punished very much, and that he ordered said whip of iron to be made, and that he punished with it two who almost died in consequence. After I had read all the documents of the trial and decision, I saw that the fiscal in the said case does not approve of said punishment inflicted on the Indians. Aware that it is my duty to prevent similar excesses, because they are contrary to all humanity, I have set on foot the most secret and closest investigations in order to become acquainted with the practice of the Rev. Fathers of the missions of this territory concerning the neophytes under their care.

"Having learned how the Rev. Missionary Fathers manage all these nineteen missions of the province, and having become acquainted with their zeal in their sacred apostolic ministry for the better catechetical instruction, and for the improvement of the property of the Indians when they are already within the fold of our holy Mother Church, I find that they not only regard them as neophytes, but they look upon them with perhaps more love than natural parents look upon their children.[23] In some missions they do not use a lash or whip; in others the lash is made of two ropes with which they punish the public sins of fornication and theft, to which the whole Indian population of both sexes are generally inclined. When the missionaries discover that some have fallen into one or the other of these vices, and only when reprimands have failed to be effective, they apply the punishment of the lash; twelve or fifteen strokes are then administered to each one. This whipping is more adapted to children of six years than to men, most of whom receive it without an exclamation of pain.

"With regard to the conduct of the late Fr. Andrés Quintana I have learned that he was a very pious missionary, and that while seriously ill himself his complying with the duties of his ministry was rather the cause of his premature death; for while undergoing medical treatment at this Mission of San Carlos, his companion at Santa Cruz fell sick. In order that the latter might come to receive treatment, Fr. Quintana departed for his mission. It was then that the misfortune happened. I also know that this good Father went to excess, not in punishing his Indians but in the love with which he ever regarded them.[24] He strained all his faculties as far as zeal and industry carried him in order to improve and advance them. He distinguished himself among many for the solicitude and tenderness of his paternal care to relieve his neophytes of whatever savored of

[23] "No solamente los miran como neofitos, si quizas mas amorosamente que los padres naturales á sus hijos."

[24] "se excedió no en castigo de sus Indios sino en el amor con que siempre los miró."

troublesome vexation. For this he would not hesitate to sacrifice his own tranquillity. It may even be said that this good disposition of mind, or call it zeal peculiar to his ministry, was consuming him internally, as is very well known here.

"When I see with my own eyes the reputation and good name of the Rev. Fr. Andrés Quintana—may he rest in peace—blackened, and more, that from the unfounded allega-



Signature of Fr. Andrés Quintana.

tions which the criminals of Santa Cruz have made in their defense, namely that this just man had gone to excess in punishing, conclusions might be drawn of the conduct of the other Missionary Fathers of the province, I believe it my duty to see that justice is done to the good name which is endangered not only in the said Fr. Quintana in the stillness of the grave whither the most sacrilegious, cruel, and detestable ingratitude has sent him, but also in all the other Fathers, who are worthy of the highest regard of the justice-loving heart of Your Excellency and of that of our beloved sovereign on account of the many hardships which they suffer in the spiritual and temporal field which they cultivate with so much edification." [25]

Two months previously to that date Governor Solá had written a letter to the Fr. Comisario-Prefecto exonerating Fr. Quintana. In reply Fr. Sarriá says: "I have received to-day your letter vindicating the honor of Fr. Quintana, may he rest in peace. It appears good and satisfactory, and demands nothing more from us than that we give you our sincerest thanks for such great favor. This I do in

[25] Solá to Viceroy Féliz M. Calleja, June 2nd, 1816. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

my name and in the name of the rest of the Fathers. It seems to me that you describe well the distinctive characteristics of said Fr. Quintana in what you say about him." [26]

The same year 1812 will be forever memorable as the year of earthquakes. The wildest terror prevailed in the territory from Mission Purisima to Mission San Juan Capistrano. At the former place all the buildings were wrecked, so that the Fathers removed to another locality on the other side of Santa Inés River. At San Juan Capistrano the new stone church came down and crushed thirty-nine Indians under its ruins. The church at Santa Barbara Mission was damaged beyond repair, so that another had to be erected. Details will be found in the local annals.[27]

Meanwhile the effects of the revolt in Mexico began to be felt in California. As early as April 10th, 1811, Fr. Guardian Garijo informed Fr. Tápis that it was useless to propose any subject concerning the missions to the viceroy; that the transport *La Princesa* on arriving at San Blas from California, not aware that the port was in the hands of rebels, had been captured, and that Fathers Norberto Santiago and Domingo Carranza, who had come along as passengers, had been made prisoners. Fortunately the sentence had not been executed, the Fr. Guardian writes, and both were now at Guadalajara.[28] The insurgents, however, had made the roads so unsafe that it was not possible to forward the annual Memorias, nor send the five religious intended for the missions.[29] Two months later the Fr. Guardian found a way out of the difficulty as far as the five recruits were concerned. Instead of traveling directly west to San Blas, they left the College on July 1st, 1811, journeyed south, and took passage at Acapulco for Loreto

---

[26] Fr. Sarriá to Solá, April 3rd, 1816. "Archb. Arch.," no. 904.

[27] Records of missions Purisima, San Juan Capistrano, and Santa Barbara.

[28] José de la Guerra was among the prisoners. He was rescued and then served against the rebels at Tepíc. Bancroft, ii, 197-198.

[29] These friars were Fernando Martin, Antonio Ripoll, Jayme Escudé, Joaquín Nuez, and Ramón Olbés.

which they reached on April 23rd, 1812. From Loreto they sailed to Bay San Luis in the Gulf of California, and thence made their way overland to San Diego where they were welcomed in July. Another Father, Vicente Oliva, had to remain behind at Acapulco on account of illness, and did not arrive in California until the following year.[30] Information also arrived that the Memorias or goods for the year 1811 lay packed up, but that there was no hope of moving them; and that the drafts on the government of Mexico for produce and other goods furnished the troops in California already amounted to $14,000. The síndico, however, could not collect them because there was no money in the royal treasury.[31] Thus Hidalgo's rebellion was already beginning to retard the progress of the missions.

The soldiers fared even worse. Despatches received in 1812 explained that attempts had been made to send the presidial supplies by way of Acapulco, but that they had returned barely escaping from being captured by the rebels under Morélos. When the year 1813 brought no supplies and offered no prospect of any aid in the near future, the four presidio commanders represented the destitute condition of the troops to the governor, who could do nothing but express his sympathy, and echo the complaints to the viceroy. Thus, for instance, the commanders of San Francisco and Santa Barbara wrote to the governor that there were no shirts, and but little food. Juan Zestaje writing from San Blas on March 3rd, 1813, reported that no letters had arrived from Mexico in six months, and that there was no hope of sending the Memorias for the troops. Governor Arrillaga complained to the viceroy that no pay had been received in three years, and that the presidios were in a sad condition.[32]

---

[30] Fr. Ramon López, O. P., Loreto, to Fr. Tápis, April 25th, June 6th, July 25th, 1812; Fr. Tápis to Fr. López, June 2nd, 1812. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[31] Fr. Pedro Martínez to Fr. Sarriá, July 17th, 1812. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Bancroft, ii, 199.

[32] Bancroft, ii, 198-203.

To the comisario-prefecto Arrillaga on June 2nd, 1814, wrote: "On this date I notify the commanders of Monterey, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and San Diego at their request, that the missions of the district of each presidio might be able to succor the troops and give such assistance as corresponds with the needs of their families. The furnishing of the supplies which we should receive, from the governor down to the last recruit, pertains to our sovereign, but inasmuch as he or the regency that represents him, lack the means to support us, it seems to me natural to require them from those who may be able to contribute to the support of said troops." [33] Fr. Sarriá replied that the missionaries would always give what assistance they could; [34] and then issued three circulars on the subject to the Fathers.[35]

On January 20th and February 8th, 1815, the temporary governor, José Argüello called the attention of the comisario-prefecto to the destitution of the troops at Monterey and San Francisco, and appealed to him to have the missions furnish



Signature of Governor J. D. Argüello.

flour and blankets for the soldiers and their families. Fr. Vicente de Sarriá in a circular dated San Carlos February 16th applied to the Fathers of the Monterey jurisdiction, asking them to provide what their missions might spare and to charge it to the habilitado of the presidio. Though

---

[33] "Archb. Arch.," no. 402.

[34] Fr. Sarriá to Arrillaga, June 4th, 1814. "Archb. Arch.," no. 404.

[35] Fr. Sarriá, "Circulars," June 6th; October 12th; November 19th, 1814, nos. 405aa; 412, 413. See also nos. 408 and 410, "Archb. Arch."

there appeared poor prospects of seeing the drafts paid, the Fathers quite willingly assented, as may be seen from the replies attached to the circular.

"Mission San Juan Bautista will give three hundred arróbas of flour, and will continue to furnish the garments and weapons required.—Fr. Felipe Arroyo de la Cuesta."

"Mission Soledad will give two hundred arrobas of flour, and will continue to provide the covering for the body and the weapons asked for.—Fr. Antonio Jayme."

"Mission San Antonio has no grain left, but will contrive to give one hundred arróbas of flour, and will always continue to furnish the clothing and weapons requested.—Fr. Juan Bautista Sancho."

"Mission San Miguel has no wheat nor cloth for blankets, but can furnish some barrels of wine, which may be sold and with the proceeds clothing and weapons may be procured. One hundred arróbas of wool will also be forwarded. —Fr. Juan Martin."

"Mission San Luis Obispo, on account of epidemics and the locusts which have three times consumed the corn, can provide no produce. Some blankets may be spared.—Fr. Luis Antonio Martínez."

"Mission San Carlos produces no more flour than it consumes. Some serápes will be furnished as we have done in past years; but there is not wool sufficient here to clothe the Indians.—Fr. Juan Amorós." [36]

On January 5th, 1816, Fr. Prefecto Sarriá issued another circular in behalf of the troops of Monterey who then needed woolen cloth.[37] Fr. Juan Amorós from San Carlos replied that the mission possessed not enough wool to clothe the neophytes. For all that he would furnish twenty-five blankets. Fr. Antonio Jayme of Soledad reported that wool was scarce, but he would beg some from other missions, and meanwhile forward twenty-five blankets. Fr. Tápis notified Fr. Sarriá that Mission San Juan Bautista would manu-

[36] Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," February 16th, 1815. "Sta. Barb. Arch."
[37] "Archb. Arch.," no. 453.

facture fifty blankets without delay.[38] Fr. Pedro Cabot of San Antonio informed the Fr. Comisario-Prefecto that three hundred blankets promised for the soldiers were ready.[39] This goes to show that the missionaries strained every nerve to assist the troops.

The situation might have been improved if the missions and settlers had been at liberty to trade with foreign vessels. Little produce could have been spared, now that the burden of providing for the military and their families rested entirely on the missionary establishments; but foreign merchants eagerly exchanged groceries, ironware, and household goods for hides, tallow, and wool, and the ships needed fresh meat for their crews. In this way the Fathers would have felt less keenly the loss of the stipends, because they could have thus procured the articles wanted, except church goods, to the purchase of which the stipends had been devoted. Now, however, that trading with foreigners was forbidden through the jealousy and shortsightedness of the Spanish government,[40] the missions could not dispose of their surplus product, and in consequence suffered the want of things regarded as quite indispensable. The result was that the Indians had to be burdened with labor in order to keep in clothing and to support the soldiers together with their families, whilst they themselves along with the missionaries suffered no little inconvenience. With the arrival

---

[38] "Archb. Arch.," no. 453.

[39] Fr. Cabot to Fr. Sarriá, March 7th, 1816. "Archb. Arch.," no. 467. Fr. Payeras, the presidente of the missions on September 13th, 1816, also issued a circular in behalf of the troops at the request of Governor Solá. "Archb. Arch.," no. 521.

[40] The Franciscan Superiors emphasized the king's will by adding their own prohibition. Bancroft, ii, 196; 202, claims that the friars smuggled, nevertheless, and thus "accumulated large sums of money." For this assertion he offers no other evidence than his "doubtless," "I have no doubt." He "doubtless" judges the friars after his own principles, whereas to do them justice the missionaries must be judged by their standards. At any rate, they could accumulate nothing for themselves. This he knows very well. Why endeavor to mislead the public?

in 1813 of the *Flora* and the *Tagle* from Lima, a small trade began with South America. These vessels brought cargoes of cloth and various goods for which they accepted tallow, hides, and produce. The governor received the merchandise in exchange for the grain which he had obtained from the missions for drafts on Mexico, and thus the soldiers at least experienced some relief for a time. Another source of assistance were the Russians, who continued in possession of Bodega and Fort Ross. From them the governor in a similar manner procured goods in exchange for supplies.[41]

[41] Bancroft, ii, 202.

CHAPTER II.

Zeal of the Friars.—Fr. Juan Cabot's Expedition.—Fr. Luis Martínez's Expedition.—Soldiers Necessary as Guards.—Expedition to the Sacramento.—Fr. Payéras's Appeal.—Mortality at San Francisco.—Various Causes.—Founding of Mission San Rafael.—Disaster at San Buenaventura.—More Runaways.—The Causes.—Fr. Payéras's Warning.—Fr. Martínez's Statement.—Governor Solá Worried.—He Takes Action.—Various Expeditions.—The Mojaves Revenge Themselves.—Fr. Joaquín Nuez's Diary.—Solá's Regulations to the Corporals.

NOTWITHSTANDING the many burdens which weighed heavily upon the missionaries, they never ceased to remember those who still "sat in darkness and in the shadow of death."[1] They were ever planning to start new missions, notably in the extensive Tulare Valley. The Indians there had become accustomed to the use of horses which they could easily steal from the mission herds; and the region was fast becoming a refuge for runaway neophytes. As early as 1804 Fr. Martin of San Miguel visited that country, and later reported that, unless a mission were soon established among the Tulareños, Satan, war, and venereal diseases would leave no one to be converted.[2] Political commotions in Spain and Mexico had prevented the Fathers from executing their projects. Means were wanting and the future seemed to offer little encouragement for realizing their desires. Nevertheless, efforts were made to discover suitable sites in the hope that something might turn up to make possible the founding of a mission or two.

With this end in view Fr. Juan Cabot of San Miguel on October 2nd, 1814, set out with an expedition and reached the edge of the Tulares that same night. Next day he arrived at the village of Bubal on the shore of the great lake. He estimated the population at seven hundred souls.

---

[1] Luke i, 79.

[2] See vol. ii, chap. xiii, 620-621.

On the 4th the zealous missionary had the happiness of baptizing twenty-two Indians who were all over eighty years of age, and two others thirty years old but who were at the point of death.[3] Next day he left this settlement with the conviction that the harvest was ripe and ready for the reaper. Proceeding Fr. Cabot came to Sumtache, a village of about the same number of souls as that of Bubal. Both were at war with each other. The Father intended to reconcile them, but the Sumtaches took fright under the impression that the Spaniards were coming to kill them. A short skirmish ensued and resulted in the death of a woman and two horses before peace was effected. The expedition next crossed the Rio San Gabriel, perhaps in the vicinity of Visalia, where a good site for a mission was discovered. From there the Spaniards went on to the villages of Guachame and Tache near Kings River, but found them deserted by the frightened natives. Although this locality lacked timber Fr. Cabot recommended it for a mission. On the return march a more northern route was taken to San Miguel.[4]

No mission was ever established in the regions examined, but many of the Tulareños must have joined San Miguel, for in the baptismal record of that mission the "Rancheria of Bubal" is frequently given as the home of many converts. Thus, for instance, on March 9th, 1816, Fr. Cabot baptized eleven Indians from Bubal. He visited the Tulares a second time in 1818, and discovered thirty-three Christians from various missions at Telame or Tulame. On this occasion he mentioned Bubal, Quiuamine, Yulumne, and Choinoc. Fr.

---

[3] "teniendo todos la edad que se les computo á 80 años arriba." Libro de Bautismos de San Miguel.

[4] Fr. Cabot to Fr. Señan, April 11th, 1815; Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Payéras, October 5th, 1816. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Sergeant José Dolores Pico by order of Gov. Solá on November 3rd, 1815, set out from Monterey to the San Joaquín. Next day he relates meeting Fr. Jayme Escudé at Mission San Juan Bautista. He was back on December 3rd. Pico, "Diario," "Bancroft Collection." Sergeant Juan Ortega left on November 4th, joined Pico on November 15th, and returned to sign his report December 2nd. Ortega, "Diario."—"California Mss."—"Bancroft Collection."

Cabot, reporting this visit to Captain José de la Guerra, expressed the hope that an expedition might be sent out to bring back the numerous runaways, but not as prisoners to the Monterey presidio, because from there they would be sure to run away again.[5]

Fr. Luis Martínez accompanied by troops started out



Signature of Fr. Juan Cabot.

from Mission San Luis Obispo in May 1816 to visit Tulare Valley. At the first village, Lucluc, twenty-eight leagues from his mission, he found about fifty Indians with their wives and children. The settlement lay on the border of the plain. Nine leagues beyond he discovered Tuohuala or Hubal, perhaps identical with Bubal. Continuing for eighteen leagues the explorers arrived at Gelecto. From there they wandered nineteen leagues when they came upon the rancheria of Lihuauhilame. After Fr. Martínez and his companions had journeyed seven leagues more they reached Guihuane, on the banks of a large river which flowed from north to south and prevented further progress. The little party therefore began the return march and arrived at San Luis Obispo by the end of May without having accomplished as much as was expected.[6]

Fr. Martínez reported to the governor that the soldiers had behaved themselves honorably on the journey;[7] but Fr. Cabot of San Miguel blamed the party from

---

[5] Fr. Juan Cabot to José de la Guerra, May 23rd, 1818. "De la Guerra Collection."

[6] Fr. Martínez to Fr. Sarriá, May 29th, 1816. "Archb. Arch.," no. 489.

[7] "con honradez," Fr. Martínez writes to Solá, May 30th, 1816. "Archb. Arch.," no. 479.

San Luis Obispo for the failure of the expedition, since he had found the gentiles friendly when he travelled through their country.[8] Fr. Muñoz, however, had met with much distrust and some hostility.[9] Writing to Governor Solá on the failure of Fr. Martínez's expedition, Fr. Sarriá says that such an outcome need not appear strange. It but confirmed his belief of what Fr. Para, a man of extensive experience in the matter, asserted. "I do not know," he writes, "that any conversion had been effected when the ministers of the Gospel have taken troops along. The results have ever been disastrous. The Indians begin to look upon them with dread, for the first sight of troops makes them think that subjection and loss of liberty will follow. The consequence will then be either open resistance or flight, and thus the soldiers become an obstacle to the missionaries' efforts. The Indians have no fear nor dread when the missionaries come alone. They will on the contrary receive them with many signs of good will." Expeditions for the preaching of the Gospel and those for exploration, Fr. Sarriá concludes, are two different undertakings. The latter sometimes require military aid; the former never.[10]

The Fr. Prefect must have modified his view very soon; for only four months later he approved of a guard for Fr. Juan Cabot on a tour among the Indians toward the east.[11] In view of Fr. Quintana's fate and the treacherous disposition of the savages, as well as of the apostates who flocked to the Tulares, the going away from the mission to a great distance without protection was foolhardy. Besides, royal and viceroyal regulations expressly forbade it. The great traveller and missionary Fr. Garcés, it is true, had passed through the Tulare regions unaccompanied by soldiers and

---

[8] Fr. Cabot to Fr. Sarriá, June 1st, 1816. "Archb. Arch.," no. 491.

[9] Fr. Muñoz, "Diario," November 2nd, 1806. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[10] Fr. Sarriá to Solá, June 10th, 1816. "Archb. Arch.," no. 507.

[11] See below note 14.

attended by only a few Indian guides[12] without suffering harm; but that was forty years before, when the bad example of the soldier guards and settlers had not yet aroused the distrust and animosity of the natives.

In his biennial report of May 2nd, 1817,[13] Fr. Presidente Payéras showed that some of the northern missions were suffering from incursions of the gentiles and apostate neophytes. He therefore strongly urged the planting of a presidio and some missions in the Tulare Valley. This, he said, would put a stop to the vexations; at the same time it would gain souls for heaven and subjects for the king. He especially recommended the locality of Telame, forty-five or fifty leagues directly east of Mission San Miguel, which was populated by about 4000 pagans. In 1815 an epidemic visited these people and carried away many of them. In their extremity, wrote Fr. Payéras, they pleaded for Baptism and for the spiritual food of Christian doctrine no less than for the material food; but to his grief no one could break the bread of eternal life to them on account of the great distance and the hostility of the surrounding tribes. He hoped that the king would cast a sympathetic glance at this valley, where over an area of one hundred and more leagues so many souls clamored for missionaries. Later Fr. Payéras proposed sending another expedition to the Tulares. Fr. Sarriá heartily approved the plan and recommended that Fr. Juan Cabot be selected to accompany a detachment of soldiers from Santa Barbara who might at the same time go in search of runaway neophytes.[14]

No action seems to have been taken on this proposition, but in May 1817 an exploring expedition set out for the regions farther north. This expedition was conducted by

---

[12] See vol. ii, sect. i, chap. ix.

[13] "Informe Bienal," 1815-1816. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[14] "La escolta me parece tambien que sea de Santa Barbara con el jefe que solicita V. R., pues por aqui á mas de la salida que se considera precisa del P. Juan Cabot se ofrece tambien ahora mismo la de la busca de Cimarrones." Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Payeras, October 5th, 1816. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

Lieutenant Luis Argüello. Fr. Ramón Abella of Mission San Francisco and Fr. Narciso Durán of Mission San José accompanied him and his soldiers. Leaving the beach at the presidio on the Golden Gate, Tuesday morning May 13th, the little party in two launches moved across the bay to the Isla de los Angeles. From here they continued on the same day, and passed through Carquinez Strait until they reached the junction of the two rivers which formed the great river hitherto known as San Francisco. The stream coming from the northeast was called Sacramento;[15] the one coming from the southeast was known since 1806 as the San Joaquín.[16] From the mouth of the latter Argüello and his following passed up the Sacramento for about forty leagues to a place where on the 20th they carved a large cross in an oak-tree. This emblem they blessed and venerated and then returned to the presidio, which they reached at dawn in the morning of May 26th. On two days, Ascension Day, May 15th, about six or seven league above the mouth of the San Joaquín, and Sunday 18th, about fourteen leagues farther on, High Mass was sung.[17] In three Indian villages altogether thirteen pagans, aged, dying, or infants, were baptized. Many neophytes were discovered living scattered through the country. Most of them belonged to Mission San José.[18]

In the biennial report for 1817-1818[19] Fr. Payéras returned to the subject of missions in the Tulare region. This, at

---

[15] "El uno viene del N y NE y se llama del Sacramento." It is not clear whether it was so named on this occasion or previously. The river was called San Francisco down to 1811. Of any intervening expedition there is no record.

[16] Fr. Muñoz, "Diario," November 2nd, 1806. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[17] The first record of holy Mass in those regions.

[18] Fr. Durán, "Diario." "Cal. University Library," Bancroft Collection.

[19] May 4th, 1819; Fr. Payeras, "Memorial," June 2nd, 1820. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Late in 1820 "we find Fr. Payeras proposing to make in person a tour through the Tulare Valley." Bancroft, ii, 338.

all events, shows how anxiously the Fathers looked for an opportunity to bring the Gospel to the savages, at a period, too, when the support of the whole government and military of California occupied their minds in addition to their chief duty: the care of the mission population. In view of the fact, Fr. Payéras writes to the government, that the object of the sacred ministry is the propagation of the Faith among the gentiles, and as there are no more on the coast, the Fathers are anxious to go in search of them. The experiment of inviting the savages of the Tulare region to come to the missions had been tried. Those who came were instructed and baptized, but by reason of their fickleness and the evil surroundings in their rancherias always with bad results. They would come, not afoot, but on horseback, and on returning to their homes they would drive along horses from the mission herds, slaughter, and eat them. The soldiers would follow the thieves, but the swamps and lagoons surrounded by tules would offer the fugitives all the hiding-places they wanted, so that the troops could not reach them. Hence, as well for the peace of the coast missions as for the spiritual welfare of the savages, it will be necessary to establish missions and presidios in the interior. Meanwhile, missionary stations with one Father and a few soldiers ought to be founded in the Tulare Valley. If this precaution is not taken, the thieves punished, and the runaways brought back, Fr. Payéras concludes his appeal, the very existence of the coast missions is endangered.

The governments of Spain and Mexico, however, had troubles of their own, and were therefore not disposed to worry about California and its needs. Thus it was that, while the government kept control of the Pious Fund, (which in the hands of the religious would have furnished every means), and would not permit the College to send as many missionaries as were wanted, nor allow the friars to undertake the conversion of savages unattended by troops, the Fathers had to console themselves as well as they might. That they ceased not to win many of the Tulareños nevertheless, we learn from the baptismal registers of the mis-

sions, notably of those of San Juan Bautista and San Miguel. The rest of the savages in the course of time died away much faster than the Indians in care of the missionary Fathers.

Fr. Payéras had complained that wild Indians on horseback were accustomed to steal horses belonging to the missions. Governor Solá had observed as much, and he had noticed that the neophyte Indians as well as the savages were becoming too expert horsemen. He thought as such they might cause trouble to the territory, and therefore called Fr. Sarriá's attention to the royal laws and regulations which forbade Indians the use of horses. Without intending to create a hardship for the missionaries, Solá directed them daily to give to the corporal of the guard a list of the vaqueros necessary for herding the cattle and horses, and of the few men whom they needed for special purposes. He then ordered the saddles and bridles to be taken away from all others, and to announce that the soldiers would arrest any other Indian discovered on horseback. Fr. Sarriá in a circular informed the Fathers to that effect, and instructed them to comply with the governor's commands.[20]

What the friars to their grief could not accomplish in the Tulare country to the east, they had the happiness of realizing in the north. The mortality at Mission San Francisco had always been out of proportion to the ordinary rate. In reply to the governor for the reason Fr. Ramón Abella pointed out three causes for the high death rate. A large percentage of the dead were children or infants, who probably lacked rational treatment on the part of the mothers. Though Fr. Abella does not say so, it is the experience of missionaries to this day. The next cause, according to the Father, was the change from a wild to a civilized life.[21]

[20] Solá to Fr. Sarriá, January 2nd; Fr. Sarriá to Solá, January 9th; Solá to Fr. Sarriá, January 9th; Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," January 12th, 1818; Solá to Fr. Payéras, October 16th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[21] "Hay gallinas de monte y gallinas de casa; si las gallinas de monte las trahe á la casa se mueren, y en contra."

Lastly, the unfortunate people were constitutionally debilitated by venereal diseases.[22] Fr. Prefect Sarriá flatly declared that the race was dying from the gálico or French disease.[23]

The proximate cause of numerous deaths at Mission San Francisco was the inclemency of the climate which a people so constitutionally weak could not endure. This seems to have been the prevailing opinion, at one time at least; for it was seriously proposed to remove the mission across the bay and to abandon the present site.[24] Governor Solá finally suggested transferring a part of the mission population. By



Signature of Fr. Luis Gil y Taboada.

way of experiment a small number were accordingly sent to the northern shore, greatly to the benefit of their health. Owing to the difficulty of communication and for want of priests, the Fr. Prefect hesitated about the formal transfer; but when several neophytes died there without the Sacraments, Fr. Gil y Taboada offered to live among them. "I am ready to sacrifice myself in the service of these poor

---

[22] "Estan muy podridos, y ésta enfermedad de el gálico en ellos es incurable." Fr. Abella to Solá, January 29th, 1817 "Archb. Arch.," no. 698.

[23] "Debe llevar á la humanidad mucha consideracion la muchedumbre de gálicos y podridos de este mal, con que se va acabando esta pobre gente, especialmente el mujério. Parece que en algunas misiones lo mismo es casarse que tomar despacho para el cementerio." Fr. Sarriá to Solá, June 28th, 1815. "Archb. Arch.," no. 441.

[24] Fr. Abella to Solá, June 31st, 1817. "Archb. Arch.," no. 727. Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Payéras, September 7th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

Indians even to the shedding of my blood, if necessary," he wrote to Governor Solá.[25]

It was therefore resolved to found "a kind of rancho with its chapel, baptistry, and cemetery, under the title of San Rafael Arcángel, in order that this most glorious prince, who in his name expresses the 'healing of God,' may care for the bodies as well as the souls." Though the word "mission" was not used in connection with the place, the solemnities were the same as those used at the founding of a regular mission. Writing to Fr. Presidente Payéras Fr. Prefect Sarriá reports the event as follows: "The beginning was given to the foundation of San Rafael with all solemnity on the 14th of last month (December), by Fr. Abella, Fr. Narciso (Durán), Fr. Luis Taboada, and myself. We planted and blessed with solemn ceremonies the holy cross at the time of Vespers,[26] and on the day holy Mass was sung with music, *Te Deum*, and the Word of God was announced in both languages. In the afternoon there were twenty-six Baptisms of children. There are about two hundred gentiles for instruction." [27]

An unfortunate occurrence, due to military disregard of Indian sensibilities at San Buenaventura, alarmed Southern California in 1819. About twenty Mojave Indians from the Rio Colorado on May 29th arrived at the mission to trade with the neophytes as they had been wont to do. For some reason or other the guards would not permit them to converse with the Christians nor to visit the missionary. Instead they were told to stay in the guard house until they were ready to depart the next day. When he heard of it, Fr. Señan told the corporal that he had done wrong to imprison the Indians and not let them see the missionary. On

[25] "Estoy pronto, con la gracia de Dios, á sacrificarme en obséquio de estos miserables hasta derramar toda mi sangre, si es necesario." Fr. Gil to Solá, December 10th, 1817. "Archb. Arch.," no. 741.

[26] that is to say, the eve of the day, Saturday 13th.

[27] Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Payéras, January 5th, 1818. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

MISSION SAN RAFAEL, FOUNDED DECEMBER 14th, 1817.

the following morning, which chanced to be Pentecost Sunday, while the neophytes were assisting at High Mass in the church, one of the Mojave Indians wanted to leave the guard house. The sentinel in charge struck him. This naturally enraged the savage. Corporal Rufino Leiva, who with Mariano Cota came out of the church to ascertain the cause of the unseemly noise, foolishly attempted to put the Indian in stocks. Thereupon all the Mojaves ran to the rescue and killed the two men with clubs. The rest of the soldiers and the neophytes rushed out of the church, and a general fight ensued in which ten of the strangers and one Christian Indian were killed. Luciano Felix, the sentinel and the whole cause of the quarrel, ran away to Santa Barbara in order to notify the commander of the presidio. Sergeant Anastasio Carrillo with fourteen men hastened to the scene of the disaster, and succeeded in capturing four of the ten gentiles who had fled. They were put to work at the Santa Barbara garrison, but some time later made good their escape.[28] Re-enforcements were then hurried to San Gabriel because that mission lay directly in the way of the Colorado Indians, and would be the first to suffer if the Mojaves determined to take revenge. They probably saw the futility of attacking San Buenaventura, but they vented their anger on others in the south, as we shall learn presently.

However, the missionaries were not to escape vexations. Numerous runaways at this period gave them no little uneasiness; for the fugitives joined the gentiles and became a menace to the public welfare. The increased theft of horses caused additional alarm. Fr. Payéras at last appealed to the governor. He warned Solá that the whole territory would suffer if the neophytes were allowed to join the savages. "The spirit of insubordination," he wrote, "which is rampant in the world at large has reached the Christian Indians. A considerable number have withdrawn from the

[28] Fr. Señan to Solá, June 3rd, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 943. Fr. Señan to José de la Guerra, June 1st and 4th, 1819. "De la Guerra Collection." Bancroft, i, 333-334.

mild rule of the friars, and have become one body with the savages with whom they carry out whatever evil their heart and malevolent soul dictates. The contagion is general, and we must confess that the pagans are corrupted by the bad example and perverse suggestions of the apostates. The spirit of insolence and idleness is spreading and affecting even the more staid of the neophytes. The territory will see itself in trouble when it least expects trouble. We Fathers, who have the Indians under our very eyes, feel the situation with deep sorrow and concern, and we know that the whole cause of the desertions lies in the fact that the troops have ceased to go after the culprits who are unmindful of their duties. From day to day the danger of an attack from the united apostates and gentiles is growing; for they already boldly ridicule the soldiers and challenge them to fight.[29] The guards are not strong enough to resist attacks; soon they will not be able to restrain even the domesticated Indians. We, therefore, implore Your Honor to send out expeditions in order to recover the Christians, to scour the Tulare country, and to make those unruly savages feel the strength of Spanish arms. We plead that you merely restrain the Christians and savages within the bounds of what is just; for in keeping with our sacred calling, which demands kindness and mildness, we solemnly protest that in such expeditions we abhor deaths, mutilations, and whatever is opposed to Christian gentleness." [30] Three days later Fr. Payéras again urged Governor Solá to take energetic action.[31]

Fr. Luis Martínez of San Luis Obispo in a letter of September 17th, 1819, throws considerable light on the situa-

---

[29] "que con la mayor osadia se burlan ya de los soldados y desafian para la pelea."

[30] Fr. Payéras to Solá, September 17th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 950. Fr. Payéras, "Memorial," June 2nd, 1820, no. 16. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[31] Fr. Payéras to Solá, September 20th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 955.

tion. He shows that runaway neophytes then had other reasons for taking to the mountains, besides the usual desire to gratify their carnal passions and to enjoy unlimited freedom. "Never before," Fr. Martínez writes, "has so much watchfulness been necessary with regard to the soldiers. They have come to us without discipline and Religion.[32] They have been taught to suffer many hardships, but never for God and for the king. They should be relegated to the presidios, and an eye should be kept upon them. They should be given some occupation which is not useless and which is calculated to banish idleness, the mother of all vices.[33] They should be sent out on expeditions. I hear there are numerous runaways to be brought back.[34] These in union with the savages can do nothing good. When we shall be most unguarded they will be upon us suddenly, especially if a union be effected with those of the Colorado River, who know how to ride better than I. They should be made to feel the arm of the government. The viceroy ought to be notified with some energy that a territory which cannot support itself, will be still less able to sustain others. The missionary is expected to furnish shoes, boots, and even gunsticks. They want him to be tailor, weaver, mason, carpenter, and everything else without having learned it, and this too without support, without aid. Whence shall he obtain the infused science? Then, how can a poor Indian be cheerful, who throughout the year is occupied at work in a mission, when his labor procures for him nothing more than a poor suit of clothes and a blanket since he must labor for

---

[32] "estas tropas sin disciplina y religion que nos han venido."

[33] Fr. Sarriá only four days later, September 21st, ("Archb. Arch.," no. 954) notified Solá that a soldier at Mission San Carlos had seduced an Indian woman. It is mentioned here by way of illustration. Such cases were common at all missions. It demonstrates the character of the men sent to California to protect the missions. The distress of the missionaries may be imagined.

[34] Solá claimed that 150 out of 500 were missing at Soledad. Solá to Fr. Payéras, September 23rd, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

others?[35] What the work of the Indians amounts to we know. With Christianity the infused science of mechanical arts necessary for the commonwealth has not been given them. Indians are expected to be useful without a teacher. The viceroy should be asked how it can be accomplished."[36]

Governor Solá felt the weight of the arguments and of his duty to insure the peace of the territory; moreover he was on the best of terms with the friars; but the lack of revenues and the utter indifference or rather helplessness of the viceroyal government made him lose sight of the dangers pointed out by the Fathers. "I have foreseen the deplorable consequences," he writes to Fr. Payéras, "which Your Paternity with so much reason indicated to me, ever since my arrival in the province, and I have reported them to the government. I have taken the steps which were possible; but the condition of the troops is most unfortunate by reason of the want of clothing, unserviceableness of the weapons, and the lack of them.[37] To provide against the first I have petitioned the prelates for assistance in order to clothe the troops so that they can bear the inclemency of the season. As for the weapons I have asked for smiths. Please command the missionaries to go on with what each mission can supply so that the soldiers may be made ready for the expeditions so much needed for the tranquillity of the Christians and for intimidating the gentiles. Please also assign a smith to each of the four presidios in order that

---

[35] That is to say, for the soldiers in order to keep them clothed, well fed, and equipped. Even money had to be furnished. For all this the missions received worthless drafts on Mexico. Thus it was that the Fathers found it impossible to reward their neophytes with the gifts of various kinds which the childish Indians prized so highly. Lacking these the Indians grew discontented, as they were but overgrown children.

[36] Fr. Martínez to Solá, September 17th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 951.

[37] "Siendo el estado de las tropas de la guarnicion tan infeliz por su desnudez, y en armas descompuestas, y falta de ellas."

they may put the guns, lances, etc., into condition." Solá also asked the Fathers to send him monthly reports concerning the Indians who ran away from each mission. Large quantities of pinole and dried meat were to be prepared so that the troops might be sufficiently supplied on the march.[38]

Solá determined to despatch three expeditions against the fugitives and their insolent accomplices. The first started out from San Francisco early in October 1819. The company, which consisted of twenty-five men under Sergeant José Sanchez, marched by way of San José to San Joaquin Valley, where they encountered the Muquelemnes or Moquelumnes in the region of Stockton. In the fight the Spaniards killed twenty-seven savages, wounded twenty, and captured sixteen. Forty-nine horses were also recovered. Their own loss was one neophyte killed and five soldiers wounded.[39]

Another expedition, forty men strong under Lieutenant José Maria Estudillo, set out from Monterey in the latter part of October. The troop proceeded to the Tulare Valley by way of Mission San Miguel. Nothing seems to have been accomplished, except that Estudillo became convinced that, if missions were to be founded east of the lake and the river, it would require a strong garrison to protect them.[40]

Early in November the third expedition left Santa Barbara. It consisted of thirty-five cavalrymen under Lieutenant Gabriel Morága, fifteen infantrymen of a troop of soldiers who had lately arrived from Mazatlán under Lieutenant Narciso Fabregat, four artillerymen with a small cannon, and a large number of neophyte Indians. Morága was instructed to march to the Colorado, and if he found proof that

---

[38] Solá to Fr. Payéras, September 23rd, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Fr. Payéras, "Circular," October 8th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 956.

[39] Fr. Payéras to Solá, September 17th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 950. Fr. Duran to Solá, June 2nd, October 28th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 942; 959. Fr. Payéras, "Memorial," June 2nd, 1820, nos. 16; 20. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[40] Fr. Payéras, "Memorial," June 2nd, 1820, nos. 19, 20. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Bancroft, ii, 336.

the Mojaves had committed the atrocities reported to Mission San Gabriel, he was to capture the fugitives, and to give the gentiles such a lesson as they would not soon forget. After a High Mass for the success of the undertaking had been celebrated by Fr. José Barona of San Juan Capistrano, the little army moved out from San Gabriel on November 22nd under the patronage of our Lady of Pilár and of St. Gabriel, the Archangel. Fr. Pascual Nuez accompanied the troops as chaplain and diarist. On November 27th, about forty-two leagues from the mission, the soldiers discovered the remains of four neophytes from San Gabriel, three from San Fernando, and of some pagans who had all been murdered by the Mojaves.[41]

Next day, which was the First Sunday in Advent, Fr. Nuez celebrated a High Mass and preached. After that the bones of the dead were borne in procession to the temporary chapel where Fr. Nuez had celebrated holy Mass. Here the funeral ceremonies were held. The remains were then taken back to the scene of the murder and buried beneath a large cross which the Father had blessed that morning. The place thereafter was known as Las Animas Benditas de Atongaibit. On the feast of St. Andrew, November 30th, Fr. Nuez celebrated holy Mass at San Hilário de Cacaumeat, whereupon the march was resumed. He also offered the holy Sacrifice and preached on Sunday, December 5th; December 8th, the feast of the Immaculate Conception, again at San Hilário; and on December 12th, the feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe, at Santísima Trinidad, six and one-half leagues from Cucamonga. Meanwhile on December 2nd Morága with ten soldiers and four settlers left the main body at San Joaquin and Santa Ana, and rode ahead to overtake the murderous Mojaves. After travelling all day and part of the night the lieutenant found that the horses could go no farther for want of water and grass. He therefore rejoined Fr. Nuez at the camp of San Joaquin and Santa Ana. On

[41] In this way the Mojaves revenged themselves for the wrong they suffered at San Buenaventura. Moraga learned that the savages had committed various other murders all along his route.

the 7th the return march was begun, and at noon of the 14th all found themselves back at Mission San Gabriel. Further attempts to punish the Mojaves were postponed to a more favorable season.[42]

From the manner with which the corporal of Mission San Buenaventura dealt with the unoffending Mojaves in spite



Signature of Fr. Joaquin Pasqual Nuez.

of the protest of the missionary, we can infer that the soldiery must also have been at fault with regard to the neophytes, and that many desertions were due to military arrogance. If we had no other evidence, though past years have furnished it in abundance, the following regulations which Governor Solá had issued to the soldiers only the year before, would suffice to prove the supposition.

"Whereas it has come to my knowledge that some of the corporals of the guards have become guilty of inhuman treatment, and have arrogated to themselves powers which they cannot have in punishing Indians in their own name with excessive lashes,[43] I have considered it my duty to put an end to this abuse and to instruct Your Honors for the

---

[42] Fr. Nuez, Diário, December 16th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch." The route of the expedition was: La Puente, 4 leagues; Cucamonga or Nuestra Señora del Pilár, 8 leagues; Cajon de San Gabriel de Amuscopiabit, 9 leagues; Guadalupe de Guapiabit, 9.5 leagues; Las Animas Benditas, 11.5 leagues; Jesus de Topipabit, 8 leagues; San Hilário de Cacaumeat, 3 leagues; San Miguel de Sisuguina, 4 leagues; San Joaquín y Santa Ana de Angayaba, 14.5 leagues. From here Morága went ahead some distance; thence back to San Gabriel.

[43] "que algunos cabos de escolta faltando á la humanidad se han tomado autoridades que no pueden tener castigando de por si con excesivos azotes á los Indios."

future to make known and to see that the following directions be carried out in all places in your charge:

"1. No guard corporal is authorized to use the lash in his own name on any Christian or pagan Indian, unless the Rev. Missionary Father surrenders the Indian to him or orders him to seize the Indian and specifies the punishment he must apply. In this case he must seize or capture the Indian, inflict the punishment enjoined, and inform me through the next mail.

"2. The corporal of the guard shall give a detailed report of every Indian, Christian or pagan, who has been arrested for some crime committed, to his own presidio commander, in order that through him I may receive it and impose the punishment of which I consider him deserving.

"3. In order that no one may allege ignorance of this command, Your Honors will make certified copies, which you will affix in all guard-houses. Know ye also that on this date I transmit a copy to the Rev. Fr. Prefecto of the missions, Fr. Vicente Francisco de Sarriá, so that he may notify the religious subject to him for its observance, and that I may be informed of any transgression they may notice. When the comandante of San Diego has appended the acknowledgment of its receipt and circulation he will return the circular to me."

To Fr. Sarriá the governor wrote: "I send this to Your Paternity for your information, in order that you communicate it to the Rev. Missionary Fathers of the missions under your care. Let them execute it for the good of the neophytes and pagans who may present themselves, and let them report to me straightway for its correction the least transgression they may witness. July 20th, 1818. Pablo Vicente de Solá." [44]

---

[44] Solá, "Circular," July 20th, 1818; Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," August 14th, 1818. "Sta. Barb. Arch." See also similar regulations in nineteen articles of Gov. Borica, May 19th, 1797. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Missions ii, 222-228.

CHAPTER III.

Fr. Sarriá's Circular.—Evangelical Poverty to Be Observed.—Learning the Language.—Other Exhortations.—Fr. Bestard Orders Biographical Sketches.—Another Circular of Fr. Sarriá.—Handling of Money.—Scarcity of Missionaries.—Governor Solá's Beautiful Appeal in Behalf of the Friars.—San Fernando College Offers to Cede Some Missions.—Orizaba College Accepts.—The Missions Surrendered.—The Friars Displeased with the Choice.—Fr. Payéras Reelected.—No Money for Traveling Expenses.—The College Offers to Cede the Missions to the Bishop.—Vote of the Friars on the Missions to Be Ceded.—Orizaba College Withdraws.

WHILE he held the office of comisario-prefecto Fr. Vicente de Sarriá made two canonical visitations at all the missions. After returning from the second visit he on January 25th, 1817, issued a circular which contained twenty-seven articles. As its length precludes the reproduction of the beautiful document, we confine ourselves to a few extracts. "My coadjutors in the ministry," he begins his exhortation, "twice I have been the happy witness of your meritorious toil, incessant solicitude, constant and ardent zeal in the discharge of our evangelical vocation. I have seen how through the grace and benediction of the Most High, and by means of your apostolic enterprise, your example, your charity, and the journeys which you make while announcing eternal peace to all, the extension and propagation of the Gospel has been effected throughout the vast coast regions and the adjacent islands; and that through its entire subjection to Christianity the country, which before unhappily lay wrapped in the dense darkness of error and eternal death, has been transformed into a flourishing commonwealth, and has become a notable addition to holy Church, a glory to the Divine Redeemer, an honor to our Seraphic Order, and an ornament to our Apostolic College."

Fr. Sarriá then encourages the friars to continue in the observation of the Rule of St. Francis as a means of Chris-

tian perfection, especially with regard to poverty. He had noticed, he writes, that in a few missions the rooms of the missionaries appeared more spacious and contained more furniture which, though not more expensive, was more elaborate than Franciscan simplicity and evangelical poverty warranted. As to the churches, in accord with St. Francis, he says "it is right for each Father to give full reins to his ideas of beauty in architecture, art, etc., but always within the bounds of lovely, evangelical simplicity which our worthy predecessors have taught us." With regard to wearing shoes, he insists that the Fathers know this could not be practised unless there is real necessity. Lest occasion be given to even a shadow of suspicion, which the Rule expressly forbids, the comisario directs the Fathers not to receive the visits of women when these come alone or when they themselves are alone.

Fr. Sarriá then touches a subject which at that time he seemed to have at heart more than any other.[1] He calls the attention of the friars to the words of St. Paul, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." [2] "Situated as we are," he says, "whilst called to preach the Gospel we are also called upon to baptize and to administer the other Sacraments; but the success of these depends upon the former, since we shall make little progress in baptizing and administering the Sacraments, speaking of adults, unless it be our chief care and effort to evangelize or instruct the Indians beforehand." The zealous comisario next points out a method for teaching the little ones as well as the adults in their own language. He reminds the Fathers that the Third Council of Lima, convoked by Archbishop Toríbio in 1583, made it a rule that the Indians should be taught in their own dialect. Hence it is not enough, Fr. Sarriá declares, to give instructions in Spanish and say nothing in the language which the Indians understand. They must be taught in the native idiom, even though it were necessary to employ an interpreter. By way of illustration and warning the Fr. Pre-

[1] He devotes two closely written folio pages to it.

[2] I Cor. i, 17.

fect tells an anecdote. "I remember having read the case of the Rev. Juan Rico of the Company of Jesus, who as rector at Mallorca once against his custom preached in Castilian. The Blessed Alfonso Rodríguez thereupon heard the voice of God saying, 'The rector shall expiate this sermon in the fire of purgatory.'[3] When the Rev. Rector heard of it he never more preached in Castilian. At his death Blessed Alfonso saw him surrounded with brilliant rays indicative of his heavenly glory. The threat may more properly apply to us. The reward ought to encourage us to comply with what is prescribed."[4]

Fr. Sarriá next with much sorrow tells the Fathers that he has heard that not a few Indians had died without receiving the Sacraments. Any complaint on this point, he says, ought to be irrational. He therefore vehemently implores, through the love of Jesus Christ, that the missionaries allow no one to pass out of this world without the assistance of the Sacraments, and for that purpose to visit the sick, the aged and decrepit frequently. He again reverts to the subject of language, and reminds the Fathers that according to the Council of Trent no one can be obliged to confess through an interpreter, though the dying person is at liberty to avail himself of an interpreter if he wishes. The conclusion which Fr. Sarriá wishes the missionaries to draw is obvious. This subject of visiting the sick and administering the Sacraments to the dying also fills about two pages folio of sound instructions.

The comisario also strongly urges the Fathers to cultivate a taste for reading.[5] For everything else time is found, so

---

[3] The language of Mallorca was Catalonian, which considerably differs from the Castilian.

[4] There was good reason to emphasize the necessity of learning the Indian languages. See Appendix A.

[5] From his numerous letters we can see that Fr. Sarriá was a great reader; but his books dealt with dogmatic and moral theology, canon law, church history, lives of the saints, and ascetics. On these subjects he was the authority, and generally consulted by the missionaries.

time should be set apart for the study of subjects that are of use in the ministry. "Oh! how expedient it is to know how to govern our interior, our actions, and how to pay to God what we have promised!" he exclaims. "How many things relating to the service of the neophytes! How many things that also concern other people, whose obligations become our own when they make us judges of themselves in the Sacred Tribunal!" In connection with this point Fr. Sarriá dwells upon the necessity of the annual Spiritual Exercises: "for it cannot be hoped that he will enkindle fire in others who permits it to be extinguished in himself."

With regard to punishing the Indians, the missionaries are urged to remember that all the laws enacted for the natives breathe pity, favor, and gentleness. Fr. Sarriá had observed that the neophytes were made to work on St. Francis Day. He would have the day celebrated solemnly, though with the understanding that, like the feast of St. Michael, the Archangel, which was kept, it was not a day of obligation, hence not a sin to work on either day. Finally he commended the custom of tolling the bell at three o'clock in the afternoon, which was observed at some missions. He would have it adopted at every mission in order to give the people an opportunity to raise their hearts to God a few moments.[6] The practice continues at Santa Barbara to this day.

In another circular of September 3rd, 1817, Fr. Sarriá by way of warning directs the friars to refrain from accepting articles of luxury, or things not in harmony with seraphic poverty and simplicity, in return for products furnished to the Mexican transports. They should purchase things that are indispensable, such as ironware, church goods, medicines, etc. He has heard that the transports had brought up coaches and sold them on the coast. If these were intended for the missionaries they should absolutely refuse to accept them, because these conveyances were foreign to evangelical poverty and humility. If necessary, as was the case with some infirm Fathers, they might use the carts made in the terri-

[6] Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," January 25th, 1817. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

tory.[7] Also costly sombreros,[8] expensive chests, etc., must be left to people of puerile aspirations, "so that in nothing our ministry may be reproached." [9]

Fr. Presidente Mariano Payéras, as vicario foraneo of the Bishop of Sonora, in a circular also addressed the Fathers, but on purely ecclesiastical matters, such as the annual confession and holy Communion, the manner of instruction before the reception of the Sacraments of Penance and Matrimony, and reverence at divine worship.[10]

Most Rev. Fr. Juan Buenaventura Bestárd, the commissary-



Signature of Fr. J. B. Bestárd.

general of the Franciscans in the Indies,[11] on May 6th, 1816, from Madrid issued an important circular to all the provinces and colleges under his jurisdiction demanding exact reports on the state of the missions and the observance of the Rule. He wanted to know the number of religious in each district, their age, native country, place of reception into the Order, condition, offices filled by each, their personal merits, their aptitude for such and other offices, and their conduct during

---

[7] in which traveling was rather a torture for a sick man.

[8] Much money was and is often wasted in costly hats by male Mexicans.

[9] II Cor. vi, 3. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Most of the Fathers in signing the circular protested in warm terms that they would do nothing against these commands or against holy poverty. Down to the period of confiscation all indeed observed the vow of poverty scrupulously.

[10] Fr. Payéras, "Circular," December 19th, 1817. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[11] He was, on January 24th, 1816, nominated by the king to succeed Fr. Pablo de Moya, who had died December 20th, 1815, at the age of 59 years. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

the revolt. In obedience to this command Fr. Prefecto Sarriá wrote his Biographical Sketches of the thirty-seven friars living in California, and added other remarks on the conditions in California.

Reverting to the subject of holy poverty in another circular Fr. Sarriá says: "With regard to the disposition and handling [12] of money the friars have more than once expressed their scruples; but in view of its necessity for the proper administration of the temporalities which has been entrusted to us, and because there generally is no one to whom we could confide the money, I have had no difficulty in concluding that it could be done without moral violation; [13] for to whom is given or conceded a charge, it is understood that to him is also granted the means which he prudently judges necessary; and I base my resolution on the authority of the Bulls of Pope Leo X. and especially on the Bull *Omnímoda* of Pope Adrian VI. in favor of the missions. As far as California is concerned, the declaration of Rt. Rev. Francisco Rouset, a brilliant ornament of our Order, and the bishop of the diocese, appears sufficient. Since my accession to the office of prefect, I have urged the observance of holy poverty in circulars and at the visitations. Nevertheless some disorders exist here and there, but of no particular importance, such as having the rooms decorated more than agrees with our poverty; and also with regard to wearing shoes and other clothing prohibited by the Rule.[14] Though I cannot say that everything has been remedied according to my wishes, through the mercy of God there is nothing of moment to prosecute, nor anything that might seem disedifying considering the circumstances under which we labor. Indeed there are those, and not a few, who observe the seraphic Rule

---

[12] Some of the friars maintained that the mere handling of money even in the missions was contrary to their Rule.

[13] "No he tenido reparo de resolver poderse hacer sin moral contravencion."

[14] The Rule prescribed sandals. In case of necessity the Superiors could permit the use of shoes.

most strictly, so that they can be the consolation of a Superior, his lustre, his crown, his true and desired joy." [15]

One of the most serious difficulties which confronted the religious and secular authorities at this period was the question of obtaining missionaries to replace those who died, or who through age and infirmity were incapacitated, or who at the expiration of their ten years of service wished to retire. From 1810, when the Hidalgo revolt began, to 1820 the following nine Fathers died at their post: Marcelino Cipres, Francisco Dumétz, Pedro Panto, Juan Andrés Quintána, José Antonio Urrestí, José de Miguél, Juan Antonio Calzáda, Martin de Landaéta, and Florencio Ibáñez. Fathers Marcos Amestoy, Marcelino Marquinez, Pedro Muñoz, and Juan Sainz de Lucio retired to the College. During the same period only nine Fathers reached California. This left six missions, San Buenaventura, Santa Cruz, San Fernando, Santa Inés, Purisima Concepcion, and San Rafael each with but one missionary.[16]

Owing to the wars in Spain and the revolt in Mexico not many religious could be spared in the mother country, and of these but few could make their way to the coast missions. The chief reasons were the failure of the viceroyal government to pay the travelling expenses from the Pious Fund, which seems to have been depleted for want of competent management, and the difficulty of securing a ship to California. There always were some Fathers who volunteered, as Fr. Guardian López wrote to Fr. Payéras,[17] and the College, though short of help itself, was willing to make sacrifices for the sake of the missions; but there was no way to transport them to their destination. Hence, when Governor

---

[15] I Thess. ii, 19. "Se hechan á ver tambien, y no pocos, tan estrechamente observadores de la Seráfica Regla, que pueden ser el consuelo de un superior, su lustre, su corona, su verdadero y deseado gozo." Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," September 3rd, 1817. "Informe Biográfico," November 5th, 1817. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[16] Mission Records.

[17] Fr. López to Fr. Payéras, September 12th, 1818. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

Solá informed Fr. Sarriá of the royal order which again favored the Jesuits, the good Fr. Comisario replied, "Let them come as soon as possible; for the harvest is great, but the laborers are few." [18] No Jesuits, however, came, and as the governor himself witnessed the heroic efforts of the Fathers to satisfy all demands, he himself appealed to the viceroy in their behalf. On account of the beautiful spirit which it manifests and the interesting information it contains we reproduce the letter entire.

"Your Excellency," Solá writes, "The nineteen missions, which His Majesty has in this province of Upper California for the spiritual reduction of the natives under the direction of the missionaries of the College of San Fernando de Mexico, at this time are each served by two religious. Those of San Francisco, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Carlos, Santa Barbara, San Gabriel, and San Diego, moreover, have to attend to the spiritual wants of the presidios and pueblos in their immediate neighborhood. In addition they all have various stations in their agricultural and stock-raising districts at a distance from the missions where a number of neophytes are employed and whom they must visit,[19] besides different ranchos of white people at distances of three, five, and seven leagues. They are charged with the temporal and spiritual care of the neophytes, the instruction of the gentile applicants, the solicitude for the sick whose number is generally large at all the missions because of the infection from venereal diseases, which results from the prevailing vice among the Indians. Those afflicted in this manner, notwithstanding the greatest attention on the part of the friars to cure them, do not regain their health because of the entire lack of willingness to restrain themselves as soon as they see themselves half restored. These and other duties with which the missionaries are burdened do not permit them the complete execution of all

[18] "Vengan cuanto antes, pues la mies es mucha, y los operarios pocos." Solá to Fr. Sarriá, June 17th; Fr. Sarriá to Solá, June 22nd, 1815. "Archb. Arch.," no. 440.

[19] Such as Santa Margarita from San Luis Obispo and Pala from San Luis Rey.

they desire, because various Fathers find themselves worn out through age or infirmities; in such cases they are content to do for their mission what they can and what is necessary. Hence it is that the people in the presidios, pueblos, ranchos, etc., lack the necessary spiritual aid. From the pueblo of Our Lady of Los Angeles, for instance, with more than five hundred souls, scarcely twenty go every Sunday and holy-day of obligation to the neighboring mission of San Gabriel, three leagues distant, for the purpose of assisting at holy Mass. The same is observed at the pueblo of San José, one league from Santa Clara. Some stay away because they do not want to leave their home deserted; others on account of old age; others for want of means which does not permit them to leave the house. As it is impossible for the missionaries to attend the dying in their last hour outside the missions, or to hasten to a victim of sudden accident, without abandoning the mission, which cannot be allowed,[20] the outside people remain deprived of the spiritual help in that tremendous hour when they need aid more than ever to render an account to the Creator.

"I have thought it my duty to make this statement to Your Excellency in order that you may be pleased to make arrangements for the coming of twenty missionaries, so that a supernumerary may be placed at each of the seven points mentioned before, and others at various missions whence the friars because of advanced age, infirmity or debility ought to retire to be restored to health at the College, and to take

[20] i. e. to abandon the numerous seriously ill at the mission in order to attend to those at a distance whom strictly speaking they had no obligation in justice to attend. It was the duty of the government to provide chaplains for the white people from the secular clergy, or to engage religious on the same terms; but, as we have seen, the government had refused to grant an allowance for that purpose. Nevertheless, as Fr. Palóu and others stated, the friars out of charity would administer the Sacraments to the white people whenever called upon, nor would they allow any of them to die without the consolations of Religion; but it had in some places become a physical impossibility at the time of which Solá speaks.

the rest which they have deserved by their apostolic labors and hardships. I am not unaware, Your Excellency, that the College of San Fernando de Mexico, which conducts these missions, at present has no religious to send; but this can be remedied if Your Excellency would avail yourself of the information which I possess that in the new college founded at Orizába [21] by the same Fernandinos there is a sufficient number from which they could come, either by separating from Orizába and joining San Fernando, or by coming on their own account to accept the management of missions in view of the fact that they, too, are missionaries of the Propagation of the Faith; the more so as the said Orizaba College has no missions among Indians. In this way, besides giving the aid which is so much needed, as I have said, new missions might be projected to attract to the bosom of our holy Religion the numerous gentiles who inhabit the country to the east of these establishments. There are several Fathers who have their whole mind concentrated on that plan. They would most cheerfully cultivate these fields, even



Signature of Governor P. Vicente de Solá.

at the cost of the greatest hardships, in order to bring the light of the Gospel to those who are deprived of it, and thus to gather souls for Heaven. This they cannot now do for the reasons given before. There are also some missions that possess an abundance of cattle and sheep with which they could help in case the plan of founding of missions should be

[21] November 12th, 1799, by Fr. Bestard. "Orizaba College List."

realized, which at present I do not propose, notwithstanding the many petitions which the Fr. Prefect and various missionaries have offered to me, because more troops would be needed the additional cost of which the royal treasury under the circumstances is not in a condition to cover. The troops we have scarcely suffice to man the different posts and garrisons. Your Excellency's etc., Monterey, August 21st, 1816. Pablo Vicente Solá." [22]

The result of the clamors for more missionaries was that San Fernando College on June 10th, 1817, made the following offer to the viceroy: "The Fr. Guardian and discretos of the College of San Fernando de Mexico, in the most respectful manner and as far as the law permits, declare that, inasmuch as this College is obliged not only to give missions to the faithful, but also to preach the Catholic Faith to the gentiles, for which purpose at present it has under its charge in New California nineteen missions with four presidios and three pueblos; and whereas it is unable alone for the future to bear such a great burden on account of the scarcity of laborers in that vineyard, we voluntarily cede to the missionaries of Orizaba the following nine missions which are in the south: San Diego with its presidio, San Luis Rey, San Juan Capistrano, San Gabriel with the pueblo of Our Lady of the Angels, San Fernando, San Buenaventura, Santa Barbara with its presidio, Santa Inés, and La Purisima, so that our College retains the ten missions that are in the north, two presidios, one pueblo, and the villa of Branciforte, subject to the determination of His Excellency, the viceroy. Mexico, June 10th, 1817. Fr. Juan Calzáda, guardian; Fr. Miguel Lull, ex-guardian; Fr. José Gasol, ex-guardian; Fr. Norberto de Santiago, Fr. Antonio Álamo, Fr. Francisco González, discretos; Fr. Francisco Casals, secretario." [23] On July 16th the Fr. Guardian of the College of San José de Grácia, Orizaba, informed the viceroy that his community would accept the nine missions. The viceroy then notified

[22] "Sta. Barb. Arch."; "Cal. Arch.," Prov. Rec. ix, 491-494.

[23] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

both colleges that he approved of the transaction subject to the decision of the king.[24]

Fr. Sarriá received the news of the surrender from the Fr. Guardian, and communicated it without comment to the Fathers in a circular of October 11th, 1817.[25] In his "Informe Biografico" to the Commissary-General, however, Fr. Sarriá writes: "The surrender of the nine missions in the south which has been made to the Orizaba College has pleased me very much, if I must say the truth; but even this is not sufficient to provide for such a great necessity. A large portion of the missionaries who are here is composed of sick, aged, and exhausted men. There are few who have not completed the term fixed by the regulations of the College and of the sovereign in order to obtain the desired liberty to retire."[26] In a circular of March 17th, 1818, the good Fr. Prefecto informed the missionaries that the viceroy had approved of the surrender, and then ventured to say, "I hope in the Lord that the coming of these desired Fathers may not be delayed."[27] In the said "Informe," Fr. Sarriá went even further when he wrote to the Commissary-General that "under the circumstances, when there is a dearth of missionaries, exemplary lay-brothers or even *donádos*[28] could be of much assistance to the missions, by placing one of them with the missionary who stands alone."

On August 27th, 1818, Viceroy Venadito at last notified the Fr. Guardian of San Fernando that he had written to the Fr. Guardian of Orizába that, "Inasmuch as the sending of missionaries to California is urgent, which need the governor has represented to me, I have issued a decree

[24] Viceroy, Decree on the surrender of the missions, September 26th, 1817. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[25] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[26] Fr. Sarriá, "Informe Biografico," November 5th, 1817. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[27] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[28] Men who devote themselves to the service of the Fathers. They may in time be admitted to the First Order. Meanwhile they are Tertiaries Regular, who wear the habit without the cowl.

to-day that the seven religious destined for that purpose by said holy convent be paid by this general treasury $200 each, so that they may commence their journey to Acapulco, and while they are sailing to their destination, provided delays are involuntary and for just cause, they shall be assisted with four reales a day at the expense of the Pious Fund of California. The amount assigned to each religious shall be applied in this way: $70 for the expenses of the journey from that town (Orizába) to this capital, and the remaining $130 for the journey they have to make from this capital to Acapulco, which is the same with which the other religious have been helped who found themselves in the same predicament, and so I inform Your Reverence."[29] In his circular to the friars of California Fr. Guardian López gives the news, and then says that "as said communication assigns no ship nor time so that the missionaries might avoid staying at Acapulco many months at the risk of falling sick, or losing their life on account of the climate, and because of the excessive cost which they must necessarily incur, this government has been urgently supplicated to assign some ship, to fix the date of sailing, and then to notify this College in order to see if some religous may go along; but so far no reply has come."[30]

In the meantime the terms of Fr. Payéras as presidente and Fr. Sarriá as comisario prefecto expired. At the chapter held August 8th, 1818, Fr. Baldoméro López was reelected guardian of the College, and the Fathers Antonio Álamo, Juan Torrens, Juan Cortés, and Francisco Casals were chosen discretos. Fr. Cortés became vicar and retained the office of procurator for California. Fr. Mariano Payéras was continued as presidente, though he had asked to be relieved. Inasmuch as the Fr. Commissary-General had not

[29] This was a niggardly proceeding, as though the Fathers were boys incapable of handling the pittance doled out to them. The Orizabans can hardly be blamed for withdrawing in the end. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[30] Fr. López, "Circular," September 12th, 1818. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

authorized the election of a comisario-prefecto of California, the office remained vacant. Hence it was that Fr. Payéras found himself clothed with the full authority possessed by the early presidentes.[31]

When by August 1819 the new missionaries had failed to come, and the government pleaded lack of funds for not paying the travelling expenses,[32] the situation in the missions grew desperate. Of the thirty-four Fathers sixteen had asked to be retired because of infirmities, old age, or the expiration of their term of service. Fr. Payéras then proposed a plan which would remove the difficulty and fetch the requisite substitutes. He suggested that the missions, without wanting to create a precedent and for this once only, should tax themselves according to the judgment of the Fr. Presidente, in order to pay the travelling expenses of the Fathers from the two colleges. The majority of the missionaries declined to commit themselves. In their replies they stated that they would leave the decision to Fathers José Señan and Estévan Tápis, ex-presidentes, and to Fr. Vicente de Sarriá, ex-prefecto.[33] The missions, already overtaxed to maintain the troops, were not called upon to make the sacrifice. Fr. Juan Cortés, the procurator, about the same time informed Fr. Payéras that Viceroy Venadito had resolved to let the Pious Fund Estate forward to the missions in California $10,000 or $12,000, and in every subsequent year $15,000. This with the arrival of the recruits would have relieved the Fathers of all worry and heartache. Unfortunately, when the administrator of the Pious Fund was approached, he declared that he had nothing to spare. This was strange in the face of the fact that the missionaries of Lower California received their stipends,

---

[31] Fr. López, "Circular," September 12th, 1818; Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," December 18th; "Circular," January 12th, 1819; Fr. Payéras, "Circular," January 19th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[32] "El gobierno no da paso á ello, porque no hay dinero." Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," December 18th, 1818. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[33] Fr. Payéras, "Circular," August 28th, 1819, with the replies of the friars. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

whereas the Franciscans had been given nothing since the year 1810.[34]

Later on the viceroy wrote to the Fr. Guardian, "Since the prompt transportation of the missionaries to the province of Alta California is urgent, I have directed that the brigantine *San Carlos* be made ready at San Blas, in order that it may sail for those establishments by the end of February or the beginning of March next, not only taking along said missionaries, but also the Memorias which are being purchased at Guadalajara for those presidios.[35] The number of religious whom I have determined to send at present should be eight, four from your College and the other four from the College of San José de Grácia, Orizába, to whose prelate I communicate this arrangement so that the effects of the eight religious may be procured for transportation which the administrator of the Pious Fund of California will pay, as I direct on this date with regard to the $200 for each one. On the road their stipend shall be computed from the day of their departure from the College, and if delay for just cause occur they shall be allowed the expenses each day at the rate of $400 a year. On their arrival the Fr. Presidente should place the Fathers where they are most needed." [36]

Despairing of any results from their efforts to move the viceroy to send means and missionaries, the Fr. Guardian a few days before, December 4th, 1819, had authorized Fr. Payéras to write to the Bishop of Sonora in order that, "if His Lordship considered these missions already ripe, he may place secular priests there, who could attend to them as curates." [37] On the receipt of the viceroy's letter, and with-

---

[34] Fr. Cortés to Fr. Payéras, August 17th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[35] Nothing for the missionaries. They must have contemplated wistfully the drafts on which they could realize nothing.

[36] Fr. López to Fr. Payéras, January 12th, 1820. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[37] "Que si consideraba S. S. I., que estas misiones estan ya en sazon, puede poner clérigos, que las sirvan como curas." Fr. Payéras, "Memorial," June 2nd, 1820. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

out waiting longer for the four Orizaba Fathers who had given no notice of their intentions, Fathers Francisco Ibárra, Thomas Esténaga, José Altimira, and Blas Ordáz set out from the College probably in January 1820. When they arrived at Tepíc in the last week of March, they learned from Juan de Martiarena, whom the Fr. Guardian had appointed síndico for that place, that the friars of Orizaba had suspended their journey because of disagreement with the propositions of the viceroy. Fr. Ibárra and his companions finally reached Monterey in August.[38]

In the meantime the Fathers in California made no secret of their amazement and disappointment at the action of the College in surrendering nine missions without considering the views of the missionaries on the subject. Fr. Mariano Payéras, who on October 11th, 1819, had been elected comisario-prefecto, whilst Fr. José Señan became presidente, visited all the missions from north to south, and thus obtained the opinions of the friars. He waited a year for developments. Fr. Guardian López meanwhile informed him that it was necessary to cede some of the missions, but that, owing to the feelings of the missionaries on the subject, they should have an opportunity to declare which of the establishments ought to be surrendered. Thereupon Fr. Payéras on June 2nd, 1820, drew up a memorial which covers nearly fifteen folio pages. Therein he gave his reasons why the southern missions should be retained, and why instead nine of those in the north should be ceded to the friars from Orizaba. One of the reasons, and a good one, was that the aged and infirm Fathers from the south could not endure the cold climate of the north, and that, though there were pagans to be converted there whom they would gladly offer the opportunity to hear the Gospel truths, the southeast was not wanting in savages who needed attention as well. The Fathers were, however, urged to append their own views in the matter and to sign their names. All the missionaries in the nine es-

[38] Síndico Juan de Martiarena to Fr. Payéras, March 29th, 1820. Fr. López, "Carta Reservada," no date, but doubtless December 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

tablishments, which the College had offered to surrender, voted to retain them and to cede the nine north of San Luis Obispo. Of the fifteen friars in the ten northern missions, including San Luis Obispo, eight emphatically declared that if any missions must be surrendered they should be those of the north. Of the seven remaining Fathers five, among whom was the venerable Fr. Magín Catalá, would leave it entirely to the decision of the College discretory. Fr. Sarriá, who had favored the surrender of the southern missions, now stated that he cheerfully and entirely voted with the Fr. Prefect for the surrender of the northern establishments, but could not give his reasons in a mere note. With him agreed his companion Fr. Ramón Abella. Hence there was not one outspoken vote for the surrender of the southern missions.[39] As the Orizába friars, however, declined to come to California at all, for the reason that some of the dispositions of the viceroy were not acceptable to them, nothing came of the plan. The missionaries were, therefore, compelled to plod along as well as they could.[40]

[39] Fr. Payéras, "Memorial," June 2nd, 1820. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[40] We have gone into this matter at some length because Bancroft, ii, 407-410, devotes three pages to it in a way which might mislead.

CHAPTER IV.

South American Rebels Invade California.—Patriotism of the Friars.—Fr. Luis Martínez's Enthusiasm.—Solá's Report to the Viceroy.—The Viceroyal Government Awakens.—Wretched Reenforcements.—Solá Distracted.—Lodges "Chólos" in Mission San Carlos.—Fr. Sarriá's Grief.—Viceroy Venadito Reproaches the Settlers.—The Missions the Mainstay.—Their Contributions.—Fr. Martínez Surprises the Governor.—Solá Sends an Agent to Mexico.—Fr. Guardian López's Urgent Appeal.

CONSIDERABLE excitement was aroused when the American brig *Clarion* on October 6th, 1818, brought the startling news to Santa Barbara that two rebel ships from Buenos Aires were at the Hawaiian Islands preparing an attack on California. Comandante José de la Guerra at once notified Governor Solá and the missionaries of his jurisdiction. Solá on October 8th gave orders to remove all articles of value from the exposed presidios and missions to places named in the interior. Women and children should be ready to retire to these localities at a moment's notice. The live-stock, except horses for use, should also be driven inland as soon as the hostile boats appeared. The missionaries, especially Fr. Luis Martínez of San Luis Obispo, manifested an intensely loyal spirit. Fr. Martínez wrote to De la Guerra, "If I had but two cannon I should have the ships; but there is nothing, so I shall content myself with doing what I can and as long as I can. There are horses enough for flight, even as far as New Mexico, when I leave the mission burnt to the foundations. Live Fernando, while we are alive! Live the holy Church and our native country even if we all die." [1]

Two hostile ships in command of a certain Frenchman named Hipólite Bouchard appeared off Monterey on No-

[1] Fr. Martínez to José de la Guerra, November 1818. "De la Guerra Papers." Fr. Martínez had the bad habit of not dating his letters.

vember 22nd. Some high sounding language passed between Gov. Solá and Bouchard, whereupon the latter with four hundred men attacked and captured the fort, after Solá and his much inferior force had retreated to the Rancho del Rey.[2] The enemies ruined the orchard and garden, seized goods to the value of about $5000, destroyed about as much more which belonged to the officers and private persons, set fire to the buildings, and re-embarked on the fifth day after their arrival. Bouchard sailed down the coast, sacked the Rancho del Refugio belonging to the Ortéga family of Santa Barbara, and then continued southward as far as Mission San Juan Capistrano. Here the privateer again manifested his true spirit by robbing and firing the mission buildings. Bouchard by this time had learned that he could not induce the Californians to become disloyal, and therefore sailed away for Lower California.[3]

In a special dispatch to the viceroy Governor Solá candidly recognized the great help he received from the missions as follows: "Your Excellency. The necessity of rendering without delay a due account of the attack made upon Monterey by the insurgents gave me no time to express myself with regard to the commendable zeal which these missions displayed to aid not only those points that before had been indicated, but also those that might have been attacked during the invasion, by furnishing supplies, and as many tame horses as they had to replace the animals of the troops that were exhausted from the march of more than two hundred leagues. I have especially to mention the Rev. Fr. Luis Antonio Martínez, missionary of San Luis Obispo in

---

[2] In the vicinity of the present Salinas.

[3] José de la Guerra to the Fathers, November 11th, 1818; Fr. Payéras, "Informe Bienal," May 4th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."—Fr. Señan to Guerra, November 15th, 1818. "De la Guerra Papers."—Fr. Ullibarri to Fr. Payéras, January 1st, 1819; Fr. Antonio Jayme to Solá, November 26th, 1818; Fr. Olbés to Solá, November 26th; Fr. Sarriá to Solá, December 14th, 1818. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 844; 850; 851; 860. Bancroft, ii, 220-249; Hittell, i, 649-658.

this jurisdiction, fifty-two leagues from Monterey. No sooner had he heard of the presence of the two hostile vessels in this bay than he sent, though sick in bed, twenty-five volunteer Indians to our assistance. When the Indians



Signature of Fr. Luis Ant. Martínez.

returned after the ships had sailed away, and he learned that rebels were in the Channel of Santa Barbara and anchored in the roadstead of Refugio, Fr. Martínez rose and with thirty-five Indians set out, joined Captain José de la Guerra y Noriega at Santa Barbara, and accompanied the troops as far as San Juan Capistrano distant one hundred and thirty leagues, the last point attacked by the rebels. There he animated all to defend the rights of the sovereign and their own homes.

"In my previous report I informed Your Excellency that in the conflagration at this presidio there had been destroyed $2000 worth of soap, tallow, beans, corn, rice, and other goods belonging to the garrison of Monterey. No sooner had I made known the loss which the unhappy servants of the king had suffered, as also the need of one hundred and fifty machetes [4] to supply the troops, and a like number of cartridge boxes, than the Rev. Fr. Presidente of the missions, Fr. Mariano Payéras, issued a circular [5] ordering those articles to be made, and we have already received them. At the same time I asked for a contribution in favor of the company. I have been given a list which shows that the missionaries have contributed $3633.50. I have expressed

[4] Large knives, shorter than a sword and longer than a dagger.

[5] Fr. Payéras, "Circulars," March 5th; March 21st; March 29th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 928-930.

my warmest thanks,[6] and stated that I would report it to Your Excellency for the gratification and recognition of the religious. In my opinion it will be more gracious and stimulating that I reiterate the thanks to them in the name of Your Excellency, if you would deign to authorize me. Particularly do I again mention the Rev. Fr. Luis Antonio Martínez for his services and the rapid marches which he executed as I have said before; and because at the mission in his charge he has assisted and still assists the sick troops by his personal attendance and with medicines, by clothing with the products of the missions the families of the troops which compose the guard, and by succoring many others during the long period of nine years when they received no wages. God protect Your Excellency, etc. Monterey, July 6th, 1819. Pablo Vicente de Solá." [7]

Governor Solá was accordingly authorized to convey the thanks of His Majesty to all the Fathers, especially to Fathers Payéras and Martinez, for the part they had taken against the insurgents and in behalf of the soldiers.[8]

The alarming news that the Spanish possessions on the west coast were endangered by actual invasion of South American rebels, effected what numerous petitions had failed to bring about. The first report of Bouchard's attack on Monterey reached Mexico in December 1818. Viceroy Juan Ruiz de Apodaca, Conde de Venadito,[9] immediately sent orders to Guadalajara, San Blas and Sonora that two

---

[6] June 27th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[7] Solá to the viceroy. "Sta. Barb. Arch." "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xvii, 661-662.

[8] Solá to Fr. Payéras, April 4th; Fr. Payéras to Solá, April 17th. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1082. Viceroy to Solá, October 28th, 1820. "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xx, 186-187. Words were cheap. The Fathers would have preferred to see those thanks take some tangible shape, for instance, the payment of the stipends or at least of the drafts held for supplies furnished the troops during the past nine years.

[9] He succeeded Viceroy Felix M. Calleja in September 1816; the latter had succeeded Viceroy Francisco Javier de Venegas on February 28th, 1813.

vessels should be despatched with all the troops and munitions of war that they could carry. One detachment of one hundred well armed and disciplined cavalrymen under Captain Pablo de la Portilla sailed from Mazatlan on the *Cossack* on July 14th, 1819, for San Diego. Storms, however, drove the ship into the Gulf of California. The soldiers had to disembark at Bay San Luis Gonzaga, whence



Signature of Viceroy F. X. de Venégas.

they wended their way to their destination and arrived on September 16th. Forty-five men under Lieutenant Narciso Fabregat and Ensign Ignacio Delgado were assigned to the presidio of Santa Barbara, whence they accompanied Morága on the expedition against the Mojaves.[10]

The only other detachment consisting of one hundred infantrymen under Captain José Antonio Navarret in the two ships *San Carlos* and *La Reina de los Angeles* reached Monterey probably in the beginning of September. These men were best known as *Chólos*.[11] "They were most emphatically a bad lot," says Bancroft.[12] "Such is the unanimous testimony of the governor, commandants, friars, and citizens, no one of whom has a word to say in their favor. They belonged to the criminal and vagabond classes; were taken for the most part from the jails or picked up by pressgangs in

[10] See chapter ii.

[11] The term is still applied to men of the lowest classes coming from Mexico.

[12] History of California, ii, 255.

New Galicia; and they were altogether ignorant of military discipline or the use of arms. Notwithstanding the suit of clothes and two months' pay in advance, they soon proved a burden rather than a relief to California. Of mixed race and worse than mixed character, they were vicious and quarrelsome. Their conduct inspired disgust, and was the origin of the subsequent bitter feelings between Californians [13] and Mexicans." . . . "They were small in stature, wearing the hair short in contrast with the presidial troops, drunkards, gamblers, and thieves." [14] "The large majority of the privates were regular *léperos*." [15] "The moment they arrived at Monterey robberies, excesses, and murders began in California." [16] Only two weeks of their presence compelled the hero missionary of San Luis Obispo, Fr. Martínez, to complain to Governor Solá, "Never has such watchfulness been necessary in the province as at present on account of these troops without discipline and without Religion." [17]

For once Solá seems to have lost his head under the difficulties surrounding him. He determined to lodge the rogues and moral lepers in the very Mission of San Carlos, instead of keeping them under his eyes at Monterey. At the mission there was no other habitation available than the storeroom. There the governor insisted that the newcomers should take up their quarters contrary to all royal laws and common sense. Fr. Sarriá at once turned over the keys with the mild remark, "Here are the keys. We have obeyed whatever we were commanded. There is nothing left for us to do but to take up our staff and hats, and go whither obedience destines us." This was a rather tame way

---

[13] Descendants of immigrants from Mexico. They would not be called Mexicans, though they spoke the same language, but assumed the term Californians, or hijos del pais, native sons.

[14] Alvarado in Bancroft, ii, 255.

[15] José Pico, ibidem.

[16] Osio, ibid.

[17] "Tropas sin disciplina y religion." Fr. Martínez to Solá, September 17th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 951.

of making the governor understand that he was guilty of usurpation; but Fr. Sarriá like the friars generally loved peace, and therefore much too easily submitted to military arrogance. The governor now tried to make it appear that Fr. Sarriá was making himself guilty of disrespect to royal authority. "What!" he exclaimed, "will you not aid the troops of His Majesty!" "I have not said that," the missionary meekly replied; "I have said that if Your Honor bring these men right here into the mission, here are the keys of the quarters. I will not actively participate in this transaction." [18]

The governor furthermore demanded *metátes* and *comáles*.[19] Fr. Sarriá declared that as far as he knew there were no such articles for common use, that if any existed they belonged to the Indian women, from whom he would not take them, because they would need them for their own use. Solá thereupon ordered the Indian alcaldes to procure them. They did so, but regretted it the next day, and complained to Fr. Sarriá that they feared these utensils would not be returned. They were indeed taken to the presidio at Monterey, and on the following day Comandante Estudillo came for some more. Reporting the matter to Fr. Presidente Payéras the amazed Fr. Sarriá exclaims: "Why were those utensils demanded from the unhappy Indians of San Carlos to whom they belonged, as the missions possessed none for common use after it had suffered in the Bouchard insurrection! It seems to me that in such and similar cases they should have applied to other parties, such as the settlers and soldiers who have such articles. Why do not such people have to contribute in case of public necessity?" [20]

---

[18] Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Payéras, September 7th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[19] The metáte was a curved stone for crushing corn and making tortillas. The comal was an almost flat earthen plate for cooking maize.

[20] Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Payéras, September 7th and 26th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

CRUSHING SOAKED CORN ON THE METATE.

Thirty men under one officer came out and took up their quarters right in the mission, and lodged in the storeroom arranged for them. What was feared came to pass. "As I go through the Indian village," Fr. Sarriá writes, "I find this one at the door of a neophyte's hut, and that one inside the hut of another. I have told the officer, who promised to stop it; but how is it possible to avoid everything? The words of Solórzano come to my mind, 'The scum of other races kills the Indians'." [21] Only two weeks later, the good Father with keen sorrow was compelled to report to the governor that the soldiers had seduced an Indian woman.[22] Fr. Presidente Payéras on September 16th protested to Solá against quartering soldiers at the missions or letting them have anything to do with the neophytes. It is hard enough, he said, to manage the Indians with the best soldiers from the presidio as guards; but this kind of troops should be kept in the garrisons. If some must be quartered at the missions, he would direct the missionaries to construct separate buildings for them.[23] Fr. Payéras actually gave orders to that effect on October 8th.[24] Meanwhile Solá began to be troubled in conscience at sight of the grave disorders caused by his *Chólos,* and he promised Fr. Sarriá that he would remove the objectionable men before the end of the month.[25]

Neither the *San Carlos* nor the *Reina* had brought what was more needed than additional soldiers, and that was the long hoped for supplies and equipment for the troops, as well as supplies for the missionaries. Want prevailed at the presidios and among the guards at the missions, and

---

[21] "Que el vaho de las otras gentes mata á los Indios." Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Payéras, September 7th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[22] Fr. Sarriá to Solá, September 21st, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 954.

[23] Fr. Payéras to Solá, September 16th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 953.

[24] Fr. Payéras, "Circular." "Archb. Arch.," no. 956.

[25] Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Payéras, September 26th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

complaints never ceased. The commanders would represent the destitute condition of the troops to the governor; but he could only express his sympathy and echo the complaints in letters to the viceroy. The latter could send no relief because of the rebellion which consumed the income from custom duties. In reply to a letter of Governor Solá which the viceroy deemed more than inconsiderate, Venadito with much justice wrote, "Two vessels have been laden with supplies, and will take away the product of the country, thus aiding the pueblo which you say you have to feed. As to those settlers, let them go to work, as God and the king require; let them develop the rich resources of their province and talk less, and thus will they live comfortably, and also be an aid rather than a burden to the government in such trying times as these." [26] Instead "at the pueblos a large part of the settlers were content to be idle, giving the Indians one-third or one-half the crop for tilling their lands, and living on what remained." [27] Had the soldiers also heeded the advice of Venadito, there need not have existed much want in the territory. They, too, however, preferred to idle away their days, to go in rags [28] and depend for support upon the poor missionaries who in consequence with their neophytes had to suffer privations besides overworking themselves. The missions, therefore, continued to be the main and almost exclusive source of relief. Thus the very mission system, which the enemies of the friars and the despoilers of the missions never tired of denouncing, saved California and its inhabitants.

"The response of the missionaries," Bancroft acknowl-

---

[26] Viceroy to Solá, December 15th, 1819, in Bancroft, ii, 257-258.

[27] Bancroft, ii, 415.

[28] Captain James Wilcox Smith of the American schooner "Traveller," at the time of his visit in 1817, found that "the most of the troops and other inhabitants could not attend Mass for want of clothing; and the padres had neither wearing apparel, ornaments for the churches, nor implements to till the soil." Bancroft, ii, 217.

edges,[29] "was most satisfactory and liberal; especially when we consider that there were now two hundred additional mouths to feed; that the losses of the missions in connection with the Bouchard affair had been quite considerable in time, labor, and effects, besides the inconveniences naturally arising from the hasty abandonment of so many establishments, and that the *padres* made a direct contribution of about $3000 to supply losses sustained at Monterey, besides furnishing laborers and many articles to which no special value was given, and besides having been put to much trouble and expense in 1819 to protect the province from the new attacks which were feared. It is, indeed, surprising how cheerfully each mission did its part either in voluntary gifts, in regularly assessed contributions, or in response to special local demands, and how rarely even slight misunderstandings arose in individual cases. The friars seem to have realized the fact that they had the province to support, and to have made the best of it, cheering themselves with the idea that they were working for the king[30] and with the hope of better times to come. Yet at times they were very much discouraged at the prospect before them."

"Solá did not fail toward the end of 1819 to vent some of his peevishness on the friars, accusing them, as he accused everybody, of lukewarmness and failure to appreciate his own troubles and efforts; but the Fr. Presidente replied in a dignified manner that he had given no just cause for such complaints; that he fully realized the governor's difficulties, and that he had done and would do all in his power for the province. Yet he was about to resign and hoped his successor would give better satisfaction;[31] and he insisted that while the *padres* were straining every nerve to support the

---

[29] Bancroft, ii, 257-258.

[30] A materialist like Bancroft, of course, cannot conceive of a higher motive than the groveling material, and therefore he failed to understand the missionaries. The friars were animated by much loftier motives for persevering.

[31] Fr. Payéras on the contrary was elected comisario-prefecto.

troops, and doing everything except the impossible, the comandantes should be ordered to comply promptly with the friars' suggestions in minor matters, such as the transfer of (worthless) guards and details of mission discipline." [32]

It would be tedious to enumerate here the many contributions made by the missions for the maintenance of the military in California. A specimen or two must suffice to give the reader an idea of what was demanded of the missionaries and their neophytes. The governor would send his orders and they were expected to be executed without delay. Here is one such demand on a small sheet of paper. It reads as follows: "List of the woolen goods needed for the troops. 100 Sarapes grandes.[33] 80 Frazadas cameras.[34] 300 Frazadas Pastores.[35] 600 Varas de Jerga ordinaria.[36] Monterey 10th of December, 1817. Solá." [37] On March 29th, 1819, Fr. Payeras in a circular tells the Fathers that the governor wants $800 worth of corn, $200 worth of beans, 300 arrobas of fat for cooking,[38] 100 sarapes, 300 frazadas pastores, 80 frazadas cameras, 300 gamuzas,[39] 150 pair of stockings, and $1000 worth of soap, etc.[40]

"There is little to be added," says Bancroft, "on the matter of mission supplies to the presidios to what has been said. Upon the Franciscan establishments fell the whole burden of supporting the provincial government and the troops, and their dues for unpaid drafts amounted in 1820 to nearly

---

[32] Bancroft, ii, 258-259; Fr. Payéras to Solá, December 26th, 1819. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1064.

[33] A kind of blanket with an aperture in the center for the head. It was worn over the uniform.

[34] Blankets for the house.

[35] Blankets for outside use.

[36] A coarse cloth.

[37] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[38] Mantéca, i. e. beef drippings, also any kind of animal fat.

[39] Calf skins tanned soft like chamois.

[40] "Archb. Arch.," no. 931.

half a million dollars.[41] Not a dollar of stipend was received by the friars during the whole decade; and not a single invoice of goods for the missions—goods usually bought with the proceeds of habilitado's drafts and the friars' stipends—could be forwarded, except one or two of very small amount obtained from other sources. The fact that the stipend came from the Pious Fund, to which the treasury had no claim save as a kind of 'self-constituted' trustee for the missions, and the fact that other missionaries were not so entirely neglected as those of California, made the situation all the more exasperating; yet the protests and complaints of the friars were neither so frequent nor so bitter as might be expected, considering the legal rights that were being violated." [42]

Besides the forced contributions, the missionaries in behalf of their neophytes frequently made voluntary donations in money [43] and goods which amounted to many thousand dollars. The noble old hero Fr. Luis Martínez of San Luis Obispo, for instance, on July 22nd, 1820, surprised Governor Solá with the following communication: "When in the past month of April I was at the presidio of Monterey, and beheld the want of clothing [44] on the soldiers of the cavalry and artillery as well as of the garrison, and also of the fifty-nine infantrymen who arrived last year, my breast felt tormented and my heart was pierced with pain while I observed with what equanimity those worthy servants of our beloved King Ferdinand VII endured the inclemency of the weather, and much more when I considered the afflictions which Your Honor suffers in trying to remedy the troubles, maintain the soldiers, and sustain your character and responsibility as chief superior of the province which is cut off from all resource, and not having any one to aid

[41] Over $400,000, according to Governor Solá's letter to the viceroy. "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xvii, 540-542.

[42] Bancroft, ii, 405-406.

[43] As much as $2800 was furnished in October 1818. Fr. Sarriá, "Circular," September 23rd, 1818. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[44] "desnudez."

you with as much as one hundred dollars to relieve the want. These reflections more and more inflamed my ideas, and I resolved, as far as concerns myself and the neophytes of this holy mission of San Luis Obispo, which by the favor of the king has been in my charge for the last twenty-three years, to sacrifice ourselves in every way possible, in order to succor the extreme needs of the royal servants who have no equals for constancy in having persevered, though for eleven years they have received no pay, whereas formerly they enjoyed it annually. Therefore, the moment I returned to this, my mission, I began with the neophytes to weave cloth, etc." He then describes the goods which he sends and for whom they are intended.[45] Governor Solá was so touched that he reported Fr. Martínez's generosity and patriotism to the viceroy with the request to have the fact published in the official gazette. The donation consisted of a full outfit, shirts, coat, pants, and hats, for fifty-five soldiers, and for some others whom he mentioned, to the value of $751, besides eighty horses and blankets.[46] What personal privations this gift involved for the missionary and his neophytes is not on record; but inasmuch as all the missionaries themselves were in distress, and San Luis Obispo was one of the less favored, the hardship could not have been small.

Governor Solá at last seems to have become desperate and in this extremity took counsel with his subordinates. By their advice he determined to send a special commissioner to Mexico who was to lay the critical condition of the territory before the viceroy. José de la Guerra y Noriega was chosen for this important mission. He sailed away with José Bandini early in November 1819. From San Blas he wrote to the viceroy on November 26th. At the capital he succeeded in having the viceroy increase the amount of $30,000 which he had intended to deliver to the habilitado-general at Guadalajara for California. On April 15th he obtained his pass-

[45] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1094.

[46] Solá to Viceroy. "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xvii, 510; 526.

port for the return voyage and sailed from San Blas in June 1820 with goods invoiced at $41,319, but valued in California at $34,000 or $36,000. With this slight relief he arrived at Monterey in August.[47]

Moved by the appeals of the Fathers in California, Fr. Guardian Baldomero López also made an effort to obtain some relief for the missions. On January 18th, 1819, he presented the following petition to the viceroy: "By decree of Viceroy Venegas Feb. 24th, 1813, it was ordered to be paid at the treasury of Guadalajara to the missions of Alta California, the sum of $45,526.50 as stipends to the missionaries, and the drafts which to that date had been given for produce and goods furnished to the troops. Every effort was made on various occasions to obtain payment of this money in order to relieve the neophytes and missionaries with articles of the first necessity, but until now without success, and only the hope remains to me that Your Excellency will have compassion on those poor neophytes and their missionaries.

"In a communication of February 14th, 1815, Viceroy Calleja directed the Fr. Procurator of the missions in future to apply to the treasury of Guadalajara for the stipends and payment of the drafts. Urgent appeals were made, but without success. I have therefore ceased making applications in that city, because I am convinced that they would result only in useless expense as was the case until now.

"At a council of the royal treasury officials on March 31st, 1815, and by decree of Viceroy Calleja, April 15th, of the same year orders were given that at this treasury the accustomed travelling expenses should be paid for the six religious who in 1811 went to Alta California from this College by order of the viceroyal government, and for two others who returned by the port of San Blas. A small amount was paid, but though the rest was demanded on various occasions to cover the debts of the missionaries on their painful journey, nothing was paid. The same has oc-

---

[47] Bancroft, ii, 261-262; Fr. Baldomero López to Fr. Payéras, no date, but probably May 1820. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

Provincia de } Californias ~

{ **Misiones de la** Nueva California.

Noticia de las Misiones que ocupan los Religiosos de *N. P. S. Francisco Misioneros Apsticos del Colegio de Propaganda Fide de S. Fernando de Mexico en dicha Provincia. Sus progresos en los años de 1809, y 1810; numero de Ministros q.e las sirven; Sinodos q.e gozan y total de Almas con distincion de sexos.*

Misiones.	Ministras.	Sínodos.			Indios.			Españoles y gente de otras clases			Total de Almas.
		De Real Hacienda.	De Obra pia.	Total de sinodos.	Hombres.	Mugeres.	Total	Hombres.	Mugeres.	Total	
S. Diego	2	—	800	800	840	771	1611				
S. Luis Rey	2	—	800	800	778	739	1517				
S. Juan Capistrano	2	—	800	800	561	577	1138				
S. Gabriel	2	—	800	800	672	527	1199				
S. Fernando	2		800	800	480	473	953				

S. Antonio de Padua . .	2	—	800	800	658	464	1122					
N. Sra. de la Soledad . .	2	—	800	800	355	243	598					
S. Carlos	2	—	800	800	255	256	511					
S. Juan Bautista . . .	2	—	800	800	368	332	700					
Sta. Cruz	2	—	800	800	315	192	507					
Sta. Clara	2	—	800	800	764	568	1332					
S. Jose	2	—	800	800	322	223	545					
N. P. S. Francisco	2	—	800	800	595	462	1057					
Totales en. 1810. . 19.	38	//	15200	15200	9912	8858	18770					
Exîstian en. 1808. . 19.	38	//	15200	15200	9672	8926	18598					
Diferencia. 0	0	//	000	000	240	68	172					

Por la demostracion antecedente se acredita, q.e hubo de aumento en los Yndios 172. No hay vecinos de otras clases en estas Misiones, solo existen en ellas las familias de la tropa q.e las guarnece, y en alguna un Mayordomo.

En los dos años se verificaron 878. matrimonios de Yndios, se bautizaron 2873, y murieron 2507. Asi mismo en los españoles, y gente de otras clases, hubo 45. matrimonios, se bautizaron 226, y murieron 87.

curred with the travelling expenses of other religious though orders were given on December 6th, 1815, to pay the money.

"By decree of November 27th, 1815, orders were issued to pay likewise at this royal treasury $4000 on account of the drafts to pay the freight of part of the cargo sent along with the goods of the presidio in 1815 by way of Acapulco, but nothing was paid.

"If to the missionaries of the Zacatecas College the stipends are paid, the missionaries of Alta California it would seem ought to be preferred, because their territory is more remote and less able to obtain relief. Likewise the missionaries of Lower California have been paid and are paid their stipends, while those of Alta California do not enjoy this favor; perhaps it is because for only the missions of Lower California there is assigned the Pious Fund. Be that as it may, it is to be believed that the will of the pious founder was for the propagation of the Faith, and this certainly is being done in Alta California, whose missions surrounded by pagans have not less need than those of Lower California, and it seems the Pious Fund should not be limited to these only.

"The missions of Alta California have suffered and are suffering for want of missionaries. In 1815 some who volunteered should have been sent with the ship that carried the scanty memorias which were sent and had been collected since 1810; but the Fr. Guardian then determined not to send them whilst they lacked the money for travelling; for in 1815 efforts were made to recover the money to pay the travelling expenses of the six friars who had gone by way of Acapulco in 1811, and to this day the expenses have not been refunded.[48]

[48] This sounds strange; but it must be borne in mind that the College had absolutely no means save the alms which were given it. The College educated and trained the friars by means of the alms received. It furnished the Fathers for California without receiving compensation from either the missions or the government. It was asking too much to demand that the College should go begging in order to pay the travelling expenses of the missionaries, especially when there existed a Pious Fund which had hitherto borne that burden.

"Your Excellency, so many and grave are the necessities which the missions of Alta California are suffering, that the missionaries have found themselves in the dire necessity of celebrating the tremendous Sacrifice of the Mass with candles of tallow. If thus is lacking what is necessary for Divine Worship, Your Excellency, with your deep penetration will comprehend the lack of other articles of strict necessity which they have suffered.

"Every year before the insurrection it was customary to remit from Mexico copious *Memorias,* to meet the needs of the growing numbers of neophytes who were in charge of the missionaries. With the exception of bread and meat, everything went to them from here for the various branches of industry and for other needs which could turn up in the nineteen missions which were equivalent to nineteen pueblos of 20,000 neophytes. Not to forward the goods means to stop the plow, the ax, and other implements of agriculture, and this would result in the lack of wheat, corn, etc., and of course would be felt by missionaries, neophytes, colonists, and soldiers.

"These people who since the year 1810 lacked the annual help which they were wont to receive from this capital,



Signature of Fr. Baldomero López.

have suffered with resignation, and are suffering great need, whilst they are led to hope that they will be relieved, the missionaries by their stipends, the neophytes and settlers by the payment of the drafts, and the soldiers by receiving their wages; but seeing that in the course of eight years their hopes have not been realized, some fatal result is to be

feared as a consequence of the protracted want if no steps are taken to remedy it in time. This extends to all the inhabitants of New California, as is notorious to all who have any knowledge of that peninsula. It causes compassion that their labor is so useless that it does not even furnish them poor clothing and they go ill-clothed like the pagans. The discontent of the colonists and troops is great. It arises from the want of supplies in the presidios since the memorias have ceased to come which the habilitado-general used to forward annually from this capital to the comandantes of those presidios, who again helped the colonists with clothing in payment for provisions, and so they provided themselves and their families for the year. They also provided the soldiers and their wives with necessary clothing in return for their military services; but now the want of clothing is such that many of the women of the colonists and troops do not assist at holy Mass on Sundays and holydays for want of the necessary clothes to be able to present themselves in public with the decency which their sex requires.

"The suffering which has existed until now weakens them, and it will not be strange if it creates general discontent. Their dismay has already become so great, and the services they perform are more forced than voluntary, so that it may well be feared that through the same discontent the military forces may diminish, and the province remain without the necessary protection for some unforeseen case which may occur. . . There might be revolution and Spain lose the territory. . .

"Therefore, Your Excellency, my heart being penetrated with the justice with which those poor neophytes and the missionaries clamor, and the anxieties suffered there even in most favorable times, which to me are not unknown since I lived six years in those missions, I can do no less than to present to Your Excellency's consideration their sad predicament, in order that, if it be your pleasure, you apply the quickest remedy, by ordering that for the present some amount be placed at the royal treasury which may suffice to relieve the 20,000 neophytes and their missionaries who

occupy the nineteen missions; and in future, if the state of the treasury do not permit the payment of all, I beg that at least the $3000 assigned be paid every month. Only in this way is the Fr. Procurator enabled to assist the missions annually with the goods and articles of urgent necessity. . . . ."[49]

Nothing came of this appeal for what was due to the missions from the Pious Fund. Spanish rule in Mexico was then approaching its doom, so that the viceroys had enough to do to hold their own without troubling themselves about the needs of distant California.

---

[49] Fr. Baldomero López to Viceroy Venadito, January 18th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

CHAPTER V.

Fr. Payéras's Encouraging Circular.—Zealous Disposition of the Friars.—Mission Statistics.—Mission Products.—Insolence of the Soldiers.—Helplessness of the Missionaries and Their Neophytes.—Kotzebue and Russians at San Francisco.—His Strictures.—Fr. Payéras Elected Comisario-Prefecto.—Fr. Cortés's News.—Fr. Guardian's Circular.—His Commands Regarding "Carriages."—The Question Ventilated.—Fr. Payéras's Sensible Decision.

THE appeal of Fr. Guardian López in behalf of the missionaries and their neophytes having proved fruitless, the poor friars were thrown upon their own resources as before. In their affliction the sympathy of their Superiors, however, consoled and cheered them not a little. We have already seen how the venerable Fr. Prefecto Sarriá encouraged his brethren during these troublous times. His successor, Fr. Mariano Payéras, likewise understood how to conceal his own grief in order to animate his collaborators to perseverance. In the fall of 1819 he as presidente[1] visited the missions south of Purisima and thus concluded the canonical visitation of all the establishments subject to him. On his return to Purisima he issued a circular in which he writes: "I have seen and observed that everything prospers. To my own satisfaction and the gratification of Your Reverences I declare that nothing remains for me to do. With all Your Reverences I have found a most submissive obedience and the most agreeable docility. I have just reported as much with pleasure to our common prelate, the Rev. Fr. Guardian for his gratification and the glory of Your Reverences. Blessed be God! I can say that the desired object has been fully obtained. Hence, my esteemed Fathers, whilst I recognize in all Your Reverences the greatest zeal for the glory of God, the salvation of souls, and the

[1] The comisario-prefecto had not yet been named, or rather the report of the appointment had not yet arrived.

propagation of our apostolic institute, I can do no less than give you abundant thanks for such good work, and to exhort you to holy perseverance, because only he that perseveres will see his work crowned." [2]

Seven months later, addressing the Fathers in connection with the plan to cede some of the missions, Fr. Payéras as comisario-prefecto could say: "I do not believe that it can be said with truth that, as far as lay in the missionaries, and in view of the means in their power, this spiritual conquest has ever deteriorated. We have always been anxious to advance it, and if not more has been accomplished, or with more speed and promptness, it has been for lack of means, because of the peculiar circumstances of the country and its natives, and because the government, which guards and protects us, sets limits to and checks our zeal and apostolic spirit, especially where it supposes a temporal risk. Though aware of the present circumstances and needs, the danger connected with the founding of missions in the Tulares mentioned, the feebleness, infirmity, and age of many of the religious of the territory, when the Fathers hear of founding new missions the zeal of the majority rises, their hearts notably expand, and they manifest the fervent desires which animate them for the propagation of the Faith of their beloved Jesus among the savage pagans. He that makes this report, though the least of the missionaries and unworthy the name, offers himself as the first to lead the exploration if he be of any utility for establishing said missions, and to stay there with the help of God until he gives up his spirit in such a glorious undertaking." [3] Evidently apostolic fervor had not died out among the friars of this period, and it was a consolation for them to see that it was thus publicly recognized.

---

[2] Matt. x, 22. Fr. Payéras, "Circular," December 13th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Fr. Commissary-General from Madrid, August 29th, 1818, also sent the friars a letter of praise and thanksgiving which it is not necessary to repeat. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[3] Fr. Payéras, "Memorial," June 2nd, 1820; "Informe Biográfico," December 31st, 1820, punto 4to. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

Mission statistics at the close of the second decade of the nineteenth century confirm Fr. Payéras's contention that, notwithstanding the unfavorable conditions in the territory, the work of the Fathers still flourished. Some of the missions had indeed lost in the number of their neophytes; this was principally due to the high rate of mortality, and partly to the fact that in their districts there were no more pagans to convert; but on the whole the missionaries could report more Indians living in their charge than ever before. At the close of the year 1819 Baptisms in the nineteen missions [4] had reached the magnificent number of 68,218, a gain of 17,387 in nine years, and an increase of 36,920 over the number reported on December 31st, 1801. During the same period, (1769 to December 31st, 1819) as many as 18,659 marriages had been blessed, an increase of 5002 in nine years. On the other hand the death registers contained the names of 44,904 dead, an increase of 14,259 since December 31st, 1810. It was plain that the natives were slowly dying out, and this was due chiefly to venereal diseases or the *mal Gálico,* as it was called, introduced at former periods by white adventurers and soldiers.[5] The Indian population of the nineteen missions and the asistencia of San Rafael amounted to 20,010, a gain of 1240 in nine years. This leaves a difference of 3304 souls between the baptized and buried. About two-thirds of this number indicate the Baptisms of others than Indians, and the rest, or about 1100, point to the missing, such as apostates and runaways.

In temporal matters, despite the fact that they had furnished the military goods and produce to the amount of $400,000, for which they had received nothing and were not likely to obtain anything, the missions not only held their

[4] San Rafael as yet had no registers. Its Baptisms are included in the report from San Francisco.

[5] "Esta mortandad se atribue al Gálico, originado de su incontinencia ó heredado de sus padres, aunque se procura evitar dicha lamentable causa; pero no es el fruto correspondiente ni al trabajo que se toma en ello, y menos á los deseos." Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Commissary-General, November 5th, 1817. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

own, but through the almost superhuman efforts of the friars, though they were fewer in number and many of them old and infirm, showed marked improvement. The nineteen missions at the end of 1819 owned 151,313 head of cattle,[6] 186,233 sheep,[7] 1562 goats, 1926 swine, 2174 mules, and 22,984 horses of all kinds. The yield of grain in 1819 was 76,356 bushels of wheat, 23,074 bushels of barley, 25,846 bushels of corn, 5711 bushels of beans, and 2505 bushels of peas, garvanzos, etc.[8] The missions also raised various kinds of fruits for home consumption, especially olives[9] and grapes. The manufacture of wine was reported from several missions in 1798. The viceroy recommended the culture of hemp as early as 1794. An attempt was made, and in 1808 Santa Barbara, for instance, produced 5275 pounds of hemp.[10] Even cotton was among the mission products, but as no reports were required on these items it is impossible to make a safe statement. The subject will receive a more detailed treatment in the local history of each mission. Nor was account demanded by the king regarding the products of the various mechanical arts practised in those establishments.

Considerable damage was done to the crops by ground squirrels and gophers; for since the Indians had no longer need of hunting them for food, they multiplied rapidly. Locusts and grasshoppers were other plagues which decreased the crops and often destroyed them altogether. In some places a slaughter of horses was ordered by the governor to keep the numbers within limits. There was no ne-

---

[6] A gain of 35,007 over 1810.

[7] An increase of 29,719.

[8] "Informe General," December 31st, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[9] "En algunas de las mencionadas misiones se empieza á coger aceytunas; y ya en San Diego se ha hecho un poco de aceite muy bueno." Fr. Lasuen, "Informe Bienal," February 21st, 1803. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[10] Fr. Lasuén, "Informe Bienal," February 20th, 1799; Fr. Tapis, "Informe Bienal," February 16th, 1809. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Bancroft, ii, 179-180.

cessity of doing this with the mission cattle and small stock, because many of them fell victims to bears, mountain lions, wolves, coyotes and savage Indians. Many of the cattle were also killed as wild by the soldiers, when in reality the animals belonged to the missions. Fr. Amorós in particular bitterly complained of the depredations of these thieves in military uniform at San Carlos. Writing to the governor on one occasion he gives vent to his indignation in this way:

"The soldier says, everything belongs to the king, and so a wide conscience, be it whosesoever, lassoes and slaughters. The Indian is always poor; he is the one then that always kills the cattle, and to whomsoever he meets he is always bad, always the dog. It is he that should be chastised, for over the Indians all raise themselves as judges either to chastise or to denounce. If I should relate to you the damages known and unknown, which have been committed against this mission in the last four years, I should never finish. . . . This complaint may be more harmful than beneficial; yet I make it. When the soldiers see themselves accused, they will not desist from committing other vexations against our vaqueros. They will, for instance, not let them go where our herds usually gather; or they will not permit them to go whither the round-up takes place for the branding of the cattle. They will claim that this heifer or that one does not belong to the mission, or they will do other things which if done by the defenseless Indians is regarded as altogether criminal. This being so, the neophytes do not any more carry out what is justly commanded them. They do not covet the goods of others; nay, they do not attempt to preserve what is their own. Finally, Sir Governor, you know very well that we are mere administrators for charity's sake. We have no further interest in the property than the duty to manage what is for these poor people a means for the propagation of the Faith. Without assistance from Your Honor we shall scarcely be able to preserve it for them. You know that our Indians go barefooted in order that they may provide shoes for the troops and many fami-

lies. They eat their food without butter in order that the troops may have it. They do not taste beans in order to be able to deliver them to the military store; and even the branding iron is put to the service of the military. To conclude, the whole Indian is for the whole Indian. The Indian will die, but he says, 'It is for that we have the Father.' Let what has been said suffice, Sir Governor. I believe I have not been moved by passion, nor by self-interest, nor am I angered at any one; but I considered myself obliged to make said denunciation. You well know that I am candid." [11] Why the neophytes ran away under such conditions can hardly be a puzzle.

Though Spanish commercial regulations forbidding trade with foreign vessels were not relaxed, necessity, as Solá reported to the viceroy and for which he was not reprimanded, drove the provincial authorities to purchase every cargo for which they could pay with mission produce. The governor, however, insisted on the collection of duties on exports and imports according to a tariff which, it seems, had been devised to meet the needs of California. Otherwise there was practically no obstacle thrown in the way of trade after 1816.[12] In that year, October 2nd, the *Rurik* in command of Otto von Kotzebue, of the Russian navy, who had left Russia in 1815 on an exploring expedition, anchored in San Francisco Bay. He was accompanied by the naturalists Adalbert von Chamisso and Dr. John Fr. Eschscholtz,[13] the geologist Engelhardt, and the artist Louis Choris. The strang-

[11] Fr. Amorós to Solá, March 17th, 1816. "Archb. Arch.," no. 469. Though the good Father's style is abrupt and partly obscure, he pictures the situation graphically enough. If his blood had not boiled he must not have been human. More grief and maternal solicitude than anger, however, inspired his words.

[12] The prices of the period were for tallow, $1.50 per arróba; sugar, $5; rice, $2.50; wheat, $2 per fanéga or hundredweight; barley, $1; peas, $1.62; cattle, $2 to $6; mules, $10; sheep-skins, $1.50; calicoes, 87 cents per yd.; flannels, $1.75; serápes, $5; Cuzco cloth, $1.50; alpaca, $1.75. Bancroft, ii, 251; 419; 421.

[13] From him the California poppy received its scientific name "Eschscholtzia."

ers, due to previous instructions from Spain, were received with every mark of respect, and they were furnished with all they needed by the military as well as the missionaries. Governor Solá came up from Monterey to greet the foreign guests.

On November 1st they sailed away to resume their scientific observations. Kotzebue's and Chamisso's impressions were unfavorable. Beyond the country in its natural state and Spanish hospitality they saw little to praise. They found the natives ugly and stupid. Notwithstanding that the missionaries had for years with their neophytes made all kinds of sacrifices for the support of the military, the "Spanish officers at the presidio," says Bancroft, "could not refrain from acquainting the visitors with their pet grievance, and spoke bitterly of the friars, who in these times of scarcity and suffering would furnish the men with the barest necessities on formal requisition of the governor, although they had plenty of everything." [14] It is no wonder that the non-Catholic strangers were not favorably impressed with the work of the missionaries, when they heard the ungrateful officers of His Most Catholic Majesty belittle the country's benefactors, so that Kotzebue could write this ridiculous and unjust statement: "The rage for converting savage nations is now spreading over the whole South Sea, and causes much mischief, because the missionaries do not take pains to make men of them before they make them Christians." [15]

It is plain that he could not have written from close personal observation. Bancroft himself is constrained to declare that "in many respects the visitors took little advantage of their opportunities." [16] They noticed, however, what was obvious to any one, that "the soldiers seemed as discontented with the government as with the missions, and it is not surprising," says Kotzebue, "as it is already seven years since they have received any pay, and they are destitute of

[14] Bancroft, ii, 279.

[15] Kotzebue, "Voyage of Discovery," vol. i, 279. London, 1821.

[16] Bancroft, ii, 280.

almost every article of clothing; besides this, the inhabitiants are entirely without European goods, as no trading vessel is allowed to enter any harbor in California." [17]

Returning to the friars we note that the year 1819 brought a change in the government of the missions. The office of comisario-prefecto was revived by order of the Commissary-General, Most Rev. Fr. Buenaventura Bestard. The College accordingly on October 9th, 1819, at the second ballot elected Fr. Mariano Payéras by a vote of eighteen out of thirty Fathers living at San Fernando de Mexico. Two days later, October 11th, Fr. José Señan of Mission San Buenaventura was chosen presidente. The official notification reached Fr. Payéras on April 1st, 1820. He promptly named Fr. Señan as his vice-prefecto. As presidente, Fr. Señan held the position of vicario foraneo to the Bishop of Sonora, and therefore in ecclesiastical affairs he was the highest dignitary in the territory.[18]

A short time thereafter the newly-elected Fr. Prefecto received a letter from the Fr. Procurator which, though it announced the coming of four new Fathers,[19] must have mystified and surprised him not a little. "Despite our representations," Fr. Juan Cortés wrote, "we make no progress, though orders are issued to pay the missions in preference to others. It all appears to be a game of jugglery. I attribute this to the rumor that the missions possess riches, to

---

[17] Kotzebue, i, 285-286. There is much, nevertheless, which the strangers reported in favor of the treatment the Indians received. All will be utilized in the local history of San Francisco, the only mission visited by Kotzebue.

[18] Tabla Capitular, October 9th; Fr. López to Fr. Señan, October 11th, 1819; Fr. Payéras, "Circular," April 1st, 1820. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Fr. Payéras to Solá, May 26th, 1820. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1089.

[19] These Fathers were Francisco Ibárra, Thomas Esténaga, José Altimira, and Blas Ordáz. They had been approved by the Archbishop. Fr. López to Fr. Payéras, May 1820; Fr. Cortés to Fr. Payéras, January 5th, 1820. "Sta. Barb. Arch." The four friars probably left San Blas with José de la Guerra in June and arrived at Monterey in August. See page 56.

the large traffic which it is said they carry on, to what those say at Guadalajara and Mexico who come from there, namely, that nothing is wanting, etc., and to the lack of money in the royal treasury. I shall not explain further, because the Fr. Guardian will do that." [20]

The bare rumors and the reports of sailors caused Fr. Guardian Baldomero López to issue the following circular to the missionaries. Like all others it had to be read, certified by the missionary in charge of each mission, and transscribed into the *Libro de Patentes* at each establishment. After highly praising and thanking the friars for their tireless zeal for the advancement of the spiritual and temporal interests of their neophytes, and for the loyalty displayed towards the King of Spain during the invasion of Bouchard, the Fr. Guardian continues: "In order that my joy may be complete and the good name of Your Reverences be preserved so clean that malignity and envy in no way can stain or obscure it, I see myself obliged to remind Your Reverences and to counsel you as did St. Paul the Ephesians, to whom he says: 'See, therefore, brethren, how you walk circumspectly, not as unwise, but as wise; redeeming the time, for the days are evil.' [21] St. John Chrysostom, when expounding these words, says that the Apostle wanted to give the faithful to understand that they should regulate their actions and their conduct in such a manner that those who are outside the Church, and are lying in wait to discredit the Religion of Jesus Christ, could find nothing which offended the moderation of a true Christian. Hence those who in imitation of the Apostles are engaged in gathering and directing souls to God, must conduct themselves like angels among men, and like mature men among boys. They must be the light of the world, the beacons situated upon mountain peaks; and for being thus exposed to the gaze of all they must be the bright mark and guide of the world.

---

[20] Fr. Cortés to Fr. Payéras, January 5th, 1820. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[21] Ephesians, v, 15-16.

"Lest the world observe in Your Reverences anything that is not good, apply to yourselves what the universal Preacher said to the Thessalonians, 'From all appearance of evil refrain yourselves.'[22] St. Bernard explaining these words says, 'We are obliged not only to avoid what may be manifestly evil, but whatsoever has the color and appearance of evil.' Such is the kind of rumor which has found currency at this capital. It is claimed that the missionaries of Alta California travel in vehicles with two wheels, and even in coaches with four wheels; that they convey in them to and fro the officers who are to assist at the functions; that they themselves ride in them for pleasure. I have also been assured that the same pleasure was given to mariners, who thankfully praise the good will of Your Reverences in your presence, but doubt not that in your absence they will say that the missionaries of New California neither suffer the hardships which they claim, nor the privations which they publish, but that they enjoy such comfort as riding in a coach which is the privilege of the wealthy and the mighty, but not of the poor.

"On the first occasion on which I heard such talk I was amazed and unwilling to give it credit. I heard it again, tried to suppress my feelings and to verify it. I discovered it to be as I was told. Whether such vehicles have been made with the permission of the prelates, I cannot say; but I am convinced that the authors thereof have not reflected upon the consequences, and that convenience or necessity will have impelled them to construct said vehicles. Reflecting about it brought on various doubts with regard to their use, and it occurred to me that the worthy predecessors of Your Reverences never employed them, but that even the aged and infirm used horses and mules. Hence I found no reason for approving the use of said vehicles. Nevertheless, my doubts continued. In order to determine with security in this matter, I called to mind what Solomon says in his Proverbs: That wisdom rules and governs those that go to

[22] I Thessalonians, v, 22.

work with counsel; and Ecclesiasticus teaches that in order not to repent as to what was done, one should do nothing without taking counsel. I therefore consulted with the Venerable Discretorio, and proposed the question whether the use of gigs and coaches were lawful for the missionaries of California? All the Fathers Discretos, not one dissenting, declared that it is not lawful, and that steps should be taken at once that the vehicles, in the missions where they exist, should be put to other use, or should be burned, in order that no memory remain of them, because they are contrary to our humble state of life; and that in this way the enemies should be deprived of the occasion of vilifying the missions and missionaries. Therefore, in accordance with the decision of the Venerable Discretory, in order to avoid abuse which has the appearance of scandal, and which must be rooted out and annihilated entirely, I entreat and command Your Reverences, for the love of Jesus Christ, that you make no use of gigs or coaches in any manner, under any pretext, and at any time whatsoever; that where there are any they shall be burned or taken apart to serve for some other useful purpose; and that under no title shall they be given to any person whatsoever. In order that this command have more due effect, the Rev. Fr. Commissary Prefect of the missions, lest any one plead ignorance, as soon as he receives this *patente* shall have it circulated as quickly as possible; all shall read and copy it into the Libro de Patentes, and then notice shall be forwarded to me of its execution. Mexico, College of San Fernando, November 15th, 1820. Fr. Baldoméro López, Guardian." [23]

It would seem that greed was already asserting itself in some of the adventurers of Mexico. They began early to prepare for the onslaught on the mission property by vilifying the missionaries who stood in the way. Fr. Payéras received the Fr. Guardian's letter in January 1821 while at Soledad. From there on the 23rd he issued a circular in which he embodied the charges communicated by the Fr.

[23] "Sta. Barb. Arch." and Libro de Patentes.

Guardian upon the use of coaches or similar vehicles, and then admonished the friars to guard against anything that would be incompatible with the Franciscan Rule.[24]

All that St. Francis says on the subject is "they must not ride on horseback unless compelled by manifest necessity or infirmity." The Papal Expositions of the Rule, however, apply this also to travelling in vehicles of every kind. The custom of the friars, therefore, was to travel afoot, unless great distances, press of time, or infirmity, hence "manifest necessity," compelled the use of a conveyance. Fr. Serra generally walked when not forced to use a horse on account of ill health or lameness. Later the presidentes used a horse when making their visitations of the missions which extended over a distance of nearly seven hundred miles. Other missionaries likewise of necessity travelled in that way when time pressed upon them, or when infirmity precluded walking. It will be remembered that the guards, owing to governmental regulations, were not allowed to remain away from their post over night when they had to accompany a missionary for any cause whatsoever.[25] Walking the required distance in one day was often manifestly impossible. Thus a horse became a necessity. As there was a surplus of them, the question of poverty could not rise. At all events, St. Francis himself had excepted the case of necessity. It all depended upon what was a necessity. In a general way the decision of the Superior removed all doubt. At other times, when the friar had to act on the spur of the moment, his own conscience and good sense pointed out the right course to pursue in conflicting circumstances. The criticisms which came to the ears of the Fr. Guardian were more captious than sincere. They should have called for a report from the missionaries, instead of being taken for true without investigation. However, we do not find that any "car-

[24] Libro de Patentes of every mission.

[25] Borica March 2nd, 1796, forbade the priests to travel in such a manner as to keep escorts out at night. "Cal. Arch.," Prov. Rec. vi, 292-293.

riages" [26] were burnt or sold or put to other use. The reason doubtless was that there were no such vehicles in use at any of the missions.[27]

About one year after Fr. Payéras had communicated the Fr. Guardian's commands to the friars along with his own orders on the subject, he seems to have concluded that the conditions in the widely separated missions of California constituted a standing necessity for the use of conveyances of some sort besides the slow, noisy and torturing ox-carts. Writing to Fr. Presidente José Señan the Fr. Prefecto says: "I regret very much the poor state of your health. I shall never cease to ask His Divine Majesty to grant Your Reverence with a lavish hand all that may be salutary. In any case have care of yourself, and put aside anxieties as long as the little donkey [28] is not in condition to carry burdens. I too have had my ailments this year, I mean an abscess on the back of the head which forced me to keep my head bundled up. Just now I have a sore on my leg which resulted from a scratch.—With regard to the coaches, which I mentioned in a former communication, I have to say, that they are using them at the two nearest missions.[29] At Santa Barbara last March I saw a small one with two wheels which is as convenient as it is becoming, in my opinion.

---

[26] "Carruajes," all sorts of vehicles for transporting persons or goods. Carriages of those days were not the fancy and convenient vehicles of our times.

[27] Fr. Sarriá as early as September 3rd, 1817, had forbidden the friars the use of coaches at the mere rumor that some had arrived in the territory. It is not likely that any one had disobeyed. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[28] St. Francis was wont to address his body "Brother Ass." Hence the term "burrito" which Fr. Payéras here uses playfully.

[29] Santa Barbara and Santa Inés. Fr. Payéras, though comisario-prefecto, had refrained from making San Carlos his headquarters, but left Fr. Sarriá in charge; he therefore writes from Purisima Concepcion. At Santa Inés Fr. F. X. Uría was alone in charge of an extensive mission.



THE ORDINARY CONVEYANCE IN THE EARLY DAYS.

The Rev. Fathers use it with good judgment.[30] Nor should you scruple to use a similar one whenever you find it necessary or even convenient. Neither should you fear, supposing a real need or convenience and the permission of your Superior, to forfeit by its use the blessing of our holy Father Francis. The conditions of the times do not give any hope of relief, but dictate to us, especially to the aged, that we take care of ourselves. I know to whom I am speaking.[31] Your Reverence knows the great desire I have of doing the right thing. With what I have said so far I believe I have accomplished my purpose on the point in question. If perchance I erred, pardon me, Brother, and give me good counsel for the Lord's sake." [32] That settled the question for all time in California.

Since the death of Fr. Lasuén no one had possessed authority to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation. The desire had been frequently expressed that some Father receive the privilege, as there was no likelihood that the Bishop of Sonora would ever visit California. Governor Solá finally took up the matter with the viceroy, and petitioned him to use his influence. Viceroy Venadito accordingly wrote to the Fr. Guardian for his views. Fr. Guardian López communicated to Fr. Payéras the status of the question in the following letter: "His Excellency, the viceroy, asks me for information regarding the recommendation of Governor Solá showing the necessity of having Your Reverence administer the Sacrament of Confirmation. I have not reported to him, but I told His Excellency in person that it is probable that said faculty has already been granted, according to the information which I have received through the last trans-

[30] At Santa Barbara Fr. Suñer was ill and became entirely blind two years later. Fr. Jayme was laid up with rheumatism. Only Fr. Ripoll was in good health, but in charge of an extensive mission. He had also to attend the presidio of Santa Barbara.

[31] Fr. Señan was a zealous religious, and not likely to abuse the advice as might have been the case with a man who sought his ease and convenience.

[32] Fr. Payéras to Fr. Señan, June 29th, 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

atlantic mail. By the next mail I shall have definite knowledge on the subject of your solicitude. No, my dear Father, notwithstanding my burdens and anxieties, I have not neglected nor will I neglect any effort for the sake of you, my Fathers and missionaries, upon whom I have always looked with very exceptional affection. If this has not been expressly stated until now, it was because I am continually kept going up and down." [33]

[33] Fr. López to Fr. Payéras, May 1820. No date was given. The letter was marked "confidential," though the reason is not plain. "Sta. Barb. Arch." If the faculties were granted they doubtless first went to Spain to receive the royal pase. In the political commotions of Spain and Mexico the documents were then probably lost.

CHAPTER VI.

Happenings in Mexico.—The Spanish Córtes.—Its Political Divisions.—Secularization Decree.—Leyes de la Reforma.—King Ferdinand VII. Signs for Fear of Death.—Effect in Mexico.—How the Franciscans in Mexico and California Received the News.—The Fr. Guardian's Instructions.—Fr. Payéras Informs Governor Solá and the Bishop.—Fr. Payéras's Beautiful Circular.—Governor Solá to Fr. Payéras.—Bishop Bernardo to Fr. Payéras.—Fr. José Sanchez's Sentiments.—Constitution to be Promulgated.—Fr. Señan's Instructions.—Fr. Martínez on the Catecismo Político.

THE much afflicted missionaries were destined to face worse trials than unjust charges of worldly extravagance. The narrative in consequence grows sadder. At first the friars in Mexico only were affected. The source of the troubles lay in Spain. A letter of Fr. Procurator Juan Cortés to Fr. Payéras explains the situation. "The Proclamation on the Reform, I will rather say Destruction of the Religious Orders," he writes, "has been issued. In Mexico the Jesuits, the Bethlehemites, those of San Juan de Dios, of Monserrate, and the Hippolytans have all been suppressed. In our College we have for some days already two secularized Jesuits, one secularized Benedictine, and the Superior-General of the Hippolytans who is a priest. As the Reform, which was sanctioned by the king, declares that only one convent of each institute shall remain in each city, we of San Diego, San Cósme, and San Fernando[1] feared that we, too, should be suppressed; but, thanks be to God! so far we have received no notification whatever. Likewise they have gone to work publishing the Bando which deprives every ecclesiastic, secular or regular, of his privileges, but they

[1] Besides the Convento Grande de San Francisco, these three belonged to the Franciscans. Being mendicants, who possessed nothing but the buildings and churches they occupied and well-stocked libraries, these friars were allowed to continue unmolested for a while longer.

have suspended its execution, because among the Mexicans the robbing of convents has created great sensation, and a revolt is feared. General Iturbide indeed declares that the decrees of the Córtes attack Religion, and in his following he has many Europeans of good standing. Hence we know not what will happen to us, but we are all filled with bitterness. All we regulars have placed ourselves under the obedience of the Archbishop, as yet no innovation has taken place." [2]

The innovations to which Fr. Cortés alludes were made by a body of men who assembled at Leon, Spain, September 24th, 1810, just as Hidalgo raised the flag of rebellion in Mexico, and constituted themselves the Córtes of Spain. It was an attempt at government during the imprisonment by Napoleon of King Ferdinand VII., but it went further and usurped the supreme power. A large number of the deputies were men chosen at Cádiz to act as proxies for those entitled to membership, but who were unable to reach that city whither in February 1811 the sessions had been transferred. The fifty-five representatives and the forty-seven proxies, save one American, were Spaniards. The majority of these would-be legislators were university professors, ecclesiastics including some regarded as Jansenists, some public officials, and not a few young men strongly imbued with the notions of infidel French philosophers.[3]

This motley assemblage, which included the worst elements of disorder and which was anything but representative of the people of Spain or Spanish America, constituted itself the government and elected a regency composed of three officials who, in the absence of King Ferdinand VII., were to execute its decisions. On March 19th, 1812, this Córtes adopted a new constitution. Whatever authority existed in Mexico from 1810 to 1814, when King Ferdinand returned to Spain, was exercised in the name of this self-appointed Córtes of Cádiz and its regents. The members were divided

[2] Fr. Juan Cortés to Fr. Payéras, March 5th, 1821. Fr. López to Fr. Payéras, February 7th, 1821. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[3] Alamán, vol. iii, 2-3. Escosura, "Historia de España," 301-302.

into "Liberals" and "Serviles" or "Ultramontanes" as the faithful Catholics were nicknamed. The latter formed but a small minority. The "Liberals" were again divided into "Exaltados" or "Extremists" and "Moderados." "The party which assumed the appellation 'Liberal' "[4] says Alaman, the Mexican historian, "was the most ardent in promoting all the novelties which the French Revolution had produced under the influence of the infidel philosophy of the last century, yet the laws leveled at religious institutions were not exclusively its work; with few exceptions the party of the 'Moderados,' particularly the portion composed of ecclesiastics who were looked upon as infected with Jansenism, assisted in framing them."[5]

The spirit of the majority of this Córtes, which became notorious for its revolutionary tendencies, early manifested itself in the enactment of a "law" which they were pleased to call Decree of Secularization. It was passed on September 13th, 1813. As it concerned the Indian missions of Spanish America, and was frequently quoted by the mission despoilers of California to justify their proceedings against the missionaries, we herewith reproduce the "law" entire:

"The Córtes General and Extraordinary, in consequence of what has been laid before them by Don José de Olasarra, in the name of the Rt. Rev. Bishop-elect of Guiana,[6] Don José Ventura Cabello, with reference to the evils which in moral as well as political matters afflict that province, for

---

[4] A misnomer, as its attitude towards the Catholic Church and religious Orders has demonstrated to this day in German and Latin countries. "Party of False Pretenses and Oppression" would fit it exactly.

[5] Alamán, vol. v, 23; 27: "Las reformas religiosas no fueron obra exclusivamente suya (i. e. partido liberal), sino que en ellas estuvo de acuerdo, con pocas, excepciones, el partido moderado, etc."

[6] It thus appears that the bishop wanted those missions for his secular clergy. The appeal to the Córtes at this time, too, scarcely speaks well for him. At all events his move was the occasion for the decree on which the California mission despoilers based their claim. With what justice will be seen in its place.

the purpose of deciding whether or not the Indian Reductions subject to the missions in charge of the Capuchin and Discalced[7] Religious, and which for thirty, forty, fifty, and more years have already been converted from paganism to our Catholic Religion, should be delivered to the Bishop of the Diocese, has concluded to decree and decrees:

"1. That all new Reductions and Christian settlements in the provinces on the other side of the ocean, which are in charge of missionaries from Religious Orders, and which have been converted ten years, shall be immediately turned over to the respective Ordinaries without excuse or pretext whatever, conformably with the laws and decrees on the subject.

"2. That these Christian settlements, as well as all the rest that have been erected into curacies, must be provided for canonically by the same bishops with suitable priests from the secular clergy in accordance with the laws and decrees on the royal patronato.

"3. The missionaries of Religious Orders, who are relieved of the convert pueblos which are turned over to the bishop, shall apply themselves to extending Religion in other heathen places for the benefit of their inhabitants, and proceed in the management of their missions in conformity with what is commanded in paragraph 10, art. 335, of the Constitution.

"4. The Rt. Rev. Bishops and ecclesiastical prelates, in virtue of the ordinary jurisdiction belonging to them, may destine suitable Religious, as they may judge expedient, for the temporary curates of secular parish priests, only provisionally, in the parishes where necessity demands it; but such temporary curates can never aspire to be put in charge permanently, nor shall they continue in charge of the par-

[7] The Capuchins form a branch of the Franciscan Family. Discalced or Barefooted Franciscans were so called from the reform of St. Peter of Alcántara. The Reformed Augustinians were also called Discalced. We are unable to determine which Order was meant here.

ishes longer than appears necessary to the bishop in accordance with the laws.

"5. For the present, and until the Córtes with more knowledge shall resolve otherwise, the Religious Orders that may be in possession of any curacies may continue in charge of one or two Doctrinas or curacies in the district of the convents which are subject to a provincial, in such a way that the number of these curacies, which are continued, must be counted, not for the convents that are in various places, but for each province of the Order Regular under whose obedience and authority those respective convents may be, although these may be scattered in different dioceses.

"6. The missionaries from Religious Orders must immediately surrender the government and administrations of the estates of those Indians, leaving it to the care and choice of these Indians, by means of their Ayuntamientos and under the supervision of the civil governor, to nominate from among themselves those who would be to their satisfaction, and may have more intelligence for managing them, the lands to be divided and reduced to individual ownership in accordance with the Decree of January 4th, 1813, concerning the reduction of the Valdios[8] and other lands to private ownership."—José Miguel de Córdoba y Bárrios, President; Miguél Riesco y Puente and Francisco Ruiz Lorenzo, Secretaries. Cádiz, September 13th, 1813."[9]

This "law" did not reach Mexico and was not published until the year 1820, and then it came along with the announcement of other legislation directly antagonizing Religious Orders. The members of the Córtes of that year proved themselves even more "liberal" than any of their predecessors. Among its first laws was one passed August 17th suppressing the Jesuits. It relegated the individuals to the ranks of the secular clergy, and forbade them to communicate or have any relations with Superiors outside of Spain. Their property was confiscated. On October

[8] Valdios—vacant lands.

[9] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

first all the convents of monks in Spain and its dominions were declared suppressed. On motion of a proxy for Mexico, without investigating whether the victims were of public benefit or not, they adopted the resolution suppressing in America also the houses of the Bethlehemites,[10] Juanites,[11] and Hippolytans.[12] The author himself declared that he had no other object for including these religious than to get rid of friars.[13] With regard to other religious it was decreed to permit no more than one convent of each Order in the same town; that all should be suppressed that had not as many as twelve priests in the community; that no prelates should be recognized by the subjects save the local Superior elected by the members of the community; that no more convents should be established, no habit be given, and no profession be permitted, and that the estates of the religious should be confiscated.[14] The king who thus far had submitted to the vagaries of the Córtes and his ministers, refused to sign the iniquitous measures on the ground that his conscience would not permit him to be a party to such wrongs. As the authors had not consulted their own conscience in the proceedings, they saw no reason why Ferdinand VII. should be allowed the luxury of being guided by his conscience. They accordingly insisted that

---

[10] They had charge of various private schools and conducted a hospital for convalescents.

[11] Brothers of St. John of God. They conducted hospitals for the poor.

[12] Brothers who had charge of hospitals for demented.

[13] "Cuyo autor no tuvo mas objeto en ella, que 'ir quitando frailes.'" Alamán, v. 28. A noble motive, indeed! It is in keeping with liberalism.

[14] Alamán, v, 29. One is at a loss to find on what grounds the authors of such measures called themselves Catholics whilst they acted the part of Judas or Julian the Apostate. They were certainly crippling the Catholic Faith to the best of their ability. The reform of religious institutions belonged to the Church and not to unscrupulous and impertinent politicians who needed to reform themselves in order to bring their conduct in line with the Divine Precepts and common justice. See Appendix C.

the principles of the Liberal majority be carried out forthwith. Fearing for his life, as Alamán says,[15] the king finally affixed his signature. The so-called Law of Reform was then promulgated in the extraordinary session on the night of October 23rd, 1820.[16]

In Mexico, says Alamán, the people saw in the Laws of Reform only a crafty attempt to completely exterminate religious Orders. They regarded the Córtes as nothing more than a gathering of the wicked who aimed at the destruction of the Catholic Religion by commencing to persecute its ministers.[17] The viceroy was obliged to publish the wretched product of insane hatred in the City of Mexico on January 23rd, 1821, under the title of Bando de la Reforma; but he dared not execute it outside the capital against the hospital Orders.[18] If discontent with Spain had been wide-spread before, it now became general and produced a total change even in those who had sympathized with the mother country to the last. It sounded the deathknell to Spanish infidel domination in New Spain, though the men who, in after years, contrived to seize the reins of government in Mexico proved no less ignorant in Religion and full of hatred for religious institutions.

It might be supposed that the unexpected news from Mexico must have crushed the spirit of the Franciscans in California. That would have been the case if they had been the kind of men their enemies with Bancroft picture them. On the contrary, the friars demonstrated that they were composed of the same material as the Jesuits in Lower California, who without murmur allowed themselves to be

[15] "El rey, temeroso por su vida, se dejó arrancar la sancion que habia negado." Alamán, v, 29.

[16] Alamán, v, 29-30.

[17] "En general todo el pueblo no veian en la ley de reforma de regulares otra cosa que el intento solapado de su completa extincion. . . . y no mirando á la cortes mas que como una reunion de impios que aspiraban á las destruccion de la religion . . . comenzando por la persecucion de sus ministros." Alamán, v, 39-40.

[18] Alamán, v, 40-41.

driven out of the missions they had reared for the Indians. Bancroft cannot help expressing his surprise, or chagrin perhaps, at the conduct of the Franciscans under these trying circumstances. "In the communications of the guardian and prefect there appears no word of protest, no complaint, but only joy as at relief from a burden." However, that was giving the friars too much credit; he therefore turns and labors hard to show that they were not sincere, and that "the complacency of the Franciscans was for the most part assumed." [19] We doubt very much that Bancroft was sincere in making such a statement; he merely endeavored to remain true to his hostile principles, which from this date out become more apparent.

The Fr. Guardian of San Fernando College on February 3rd, 1821, received six copies of the Bando de la Reforma from the viceroy. In reply he promptly informed Venadito that he had sent two copies to the Fr. Comisario-Prefecto in California with directions to circulate them and to surrender the nineteen missions which had existed more than ten years, as soon as the bishop should wish to accept them in accordance with the decree of the Córtes. To Fr. Payéras Fr. López wrote: "Your Reverence please direct the Bando to be circulated through all the missions in order that the Missionary Fathers may learn of it and carry it out in what concerns them. In compliance with what has been decided by this venerable Discretory, Your Reverence as immediate Superior of said missions, will make the transfer of them, with all the formalities demanded, to the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Sonora, when he personally or through a representative

[19] Bancroft, ii, 432. Entirely steeped in commercialism this author will not concede that the Franciscans could or would make a step unless a dollar mark appeared within reach beckoning to be accepted. It proves how little he understood the spirit of the missionaries. Why should they cling to the control of property which to them could be of no earthly benefit, and upon which they looked as upon a heavy burden necessarily to be borne for the sake of the neophytes who could not manage the property themselves? In our opinion Bancroft knew this very well, but it did not fit into his plans to give the credit due.

may appear to receive them. You will observe with exactness whatever instructions are given by the decree of the Córtes Generales y Extraordinarias of September 13th, 1813, which is embodied in the same Bando; and you will draw up inventories with the utmost scrupulous care of whatever is to be found in the missions when it comes to give up the temporalities, and with proper authentication Your Reverence will please send them to this College for the archives. God keep you many years. Fr. Baldomero López, Guardian." [20]

Fr. Payéras received the letter of the Fr. Guardian in the beginning of July. On the 7th he promptly notified Governor Solá. After quoting Article Six of the Law of September 13th, 1813, he continued as follows: "Inasmuch as blind [21] and prompt obedience, so much due to established authorities, is an innate propensity in every son of our Father St. Francis, I and all the missionary Fathers, my subjects, declare in advance that we wish to comply punctually with said supreme order the moment Your Honor, whom in this case we regard as the organ of the higher government's voice, so determines. What I have said to Your Honor I am about to say to His Lordship, the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Sonora, the Ordinary of these missions, so that the said prelate may provide the missions with secular priests, whether or not to higher minds they already seem ripe. Would to God that these apostolic works might correspond to the distinguished zeal of the great monarch, and that it may please Your Honor to accept the surrender of them immediately." [22]

On the next day Fr. Payéras addressed the missionaries

---

[20] Fr. López to Fr. Payéras, February 3rd, 7th, 1821. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[21] Within lawful limits; that is to say, the religious need never obey in anything that is against the law of God or the Church. In this way the religious, who made the vows, is certainly more free than the members of secret societies or lodges who in German and Latin countries persecute monks and nuns at the dictates of unknown parties and in spite of divine laws.

[22] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1231. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

in a long circular, to a great extent couched in scriptural expressions the spirit of which may be gleaned from the following extracts: "My esteemed Fathers and Sirs. The Lord grant you peace. I have just received the accompanying documents from the Fr. Guardian. . . . My Brethren, Your Reverences are ministers of Jesus Christ; so am I. You are sons of St. Francis; so am I. Let us all be wise, and I like one less wise say to you, 'Be followers of me (in this matter), and observe them who walk so,' (with mature counsel and in due accord) 'as you have our model';[23] do not decline to the right or the left manifesting any desire for things temporal. Let us exhibit ourselves as what we are; and let us labor in every place and at all times like such as are responsible to the world, the angels, and men. Let us labor, I repeat, with such prudence and moderation that he who is hostile to us may have nothing bad to say against us. Let us be in accord in thought, word, and deed, and let us render ourselves worthy of blessings.

"My dearly beloved Fathers, I have received various counsels from our College, that we comport ourselves under the circumstances like angels of God counting all things as loss and as dung,[24] for because of them grave evils have come upon us. Already in January last a certain Tamariz was venting his ire against us in Mexico. Let us not imagine that decent subsistence shall be lacking us; for such would be repugnant to our noble nation, the zeal and piety of the present governor, and down to the last generous poor one in the territory.[25]

"If the bishop has priests to relieve us, what a glorious thing! . . . Meanwhile let us stand ready for everything, laboring in all sincerity and alacrity. . . . Be you therefore prepared. Have all spiritual and temporal matters, the registers and other books in the best order for the

[23] Philippians iii, 17.

[24] Philip., iii, 8.

[25] St. Francis had promised his sons that as long as they followed his Rule what was necessary would not be wanting.

final transfer, so that we can respond to the first call of both ecclesiastical and civil authorities with sonorous voice: *Domine, ecce adsum.* That is what our College expects of us all, and this is what I hope who am no less interested. The Fr. Guardian informs me that he does not believe that any more Fathers will come to the territory." [26]

To the Bishop of Sonora the comisario-prefecto wrote, "I have received through the College of San Fernando the decrees of the Córtes approved by the king and published in Mexico. In its first article the Córtes commands that 'All the new Reductions and Doctrinas in the provinces on this side of the ocean, which are in charge of missionaries from religious Orders, and which have been established ten years, ought to be immediately turned over to the respective ecclesiastical Ordinaries without excuse or pretext whatever.' Inasmuch as these nineteen new missions which were founded by the said College, and which are in my charge, have already completed and passed the term fixed by that law, in virtue of the preceding Article and in obedience to the Bull of Innocent XI.[27] *Ecclesiae Catholicae,* the Venerable Discretory of the said College directs me to place them in the hands of Your Lordship, and to make formal transfer of them whenever Your Lordship deigns personally or through a commissioner to accept them.

"Nearby and parallel with these coast missions, between east and north, we fortunately have those uncultivated districts which the sovereign describes, and which are inhabited by great numbers of gentiles who call for us and invite us, and even say like the Eunuch to St. Philip,[28] 'Why do you not come to baptize us and present us to God?' " [29]

In reply to Fr. Payéras's communication Governor Solá

---

[26] Fr. Payéras, "Circular," July 8th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1232. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[27] See vol. i, this work, p. 617.

[28] Acts of the Apostles, viii, 36. Rather freely employed by Fr. Payéras.

[29] Fr. Payéras to Bishop Bernardo, July 16th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1236.

expressed his surprise that the religious should give up the management of the neophytes. "I think that it will be very agreeable to Your Reverence to see yourself freed from the superiorship. Would that I might be relieved from this charge with the promptitude which I desire! Time will tell us all about it," the governor wrote.[30] On the same date Solá again addressed Fr. Payéras, and stated that as yet he had received no official notice of the decree that no religious in this province or the others of New Spain should continue in charge of the *property belonging to the neophytes*.[31] "I shall proceed with that care and prudence which so delicate a matter demands," he assured the Father.[32]

The bishop replied that the Act of Secularization had not been enforced anywhere in America; that the California Fathers might peacefully remain in charge of their missions until the imperial (Iturbide) government should be firmly established and dispose otherwise.[33]

What individual missionaries felt at the prospect of having to leave California, may be inferred from a letter which Fr. José Sanchez of San Gabriel addressed to Governor Solá on receipt of the Bando and Secularization Decree. "I cannot refrain from replying in the words of the first verse of Psalm 121: 'My heart rejoiced exceedingly at the things

---

[30] "Ojalá! que á mi se me relevare con la prontitud que deseo de este cargo." Solá to Fr. Payéras, July 10th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1233.

[31] "Los bienes pertenecientes á los neófitos," hence not to the friars. The Fathers regarded themselves as stewards or guardians of the Indians. Thus it was that they could readily cede their places when lawful authority so demanded, but, be it remembered, in the sense of this Act of the Córtes, not in the sense of the later mission despoilers. The governor here officially gives the status correctly. The missions belonged to the neophytes. The friars and government could in justice act as guardians only.

[32] Solá to Fr. Payéras, July 10th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1234.

[33] Bishop Bernardo to Fr. Payéras, December 20th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1256. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

that were said to me.' Yes, I assure Your Honor; for such has been my anguish and disgust." [34]

Meanwhile a military revolt in Spain early in March 1820 restored the Constitution of 1812 which had been abolished in 1814. King Ferdinand on March 9th was compelled to take the oath on it, and to publish it as the law of the Spanish dominions.[35] In Mexico Viceroy Venadito reluctantly promulgated the document and on May 31st, 1820, took the oath with the higher officials. The Archbishop and his chapter on June 1st likewise swore to uphold the Constitution.[36]

The Bishop of Sonora forwarded a copy of the viceroy's proclamation to Fr. Presidente José Señan, the vicario foraneo of Upper California, who after receiving it issued the following circular to the missionaries: "Your Reverences, in a letter from the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Sonora accompanying the Bando of the viceroy to which it calls attention, it is



Signature of Fr. Presidente José Señan.

said that the king gives it out as his will that the solemn publication of and swearing to the political Constitution of the Spanish Nation must take place on the first feast day after the receipt of these letters in all the churches of our missions. The Córtes decreed that the people and the clergy shall swear to preserve the Constitution. Those who have any jurisdiction or authority will swear by this formula: 'I swear to God and on these holy Gospels to observe the Constitution and to see that it is observed.' January 25th, 1821.

---

[34] Fr. Sánchez to Solá, April 17th, May 8th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1264, 1265.

[35] Alamán, v, 10-13. Gerónimo de la Escosura, "Historia de España," 310.

[36] Alamán, v, 16-19.

Fr. José Señan."[37] Governor Solá had already notified Fr. Prefecto Payéras to the same effect on October 9th, 1820. The ceremonies probably took place as prescribed, though we have no particulars.[38]

Along with the Constitution framed by the Córtes came an explanation in questions and answers, doubtless drawn up by a partisan. Here is what the old hero Fr. Luis Martínez of San Luis Obispo, who was celebrated far and wide for his jokes, sarcasm, and fearless speech as well as for his missionary energy, had to say about the work:[39] "The political catechism of the Constitution has arrived. The entire book does not once bear the name of God,[40] whence you can judge its erudition, its author, its public utility, and what benefits (infernal) it will bring into the world. If the deputies of the Córtes had endeavored more to put into practice what our Lord Jesus Christ taught, they would have labored less and accomplished more." In another missive to the same friend Fr. Martínez says: "The name of Jesus Christ is not seen any more in the new catechism which fell into my hands, and which some at Monterey are already studying morning and evening in order to obtain by its light the true liberty which men must enjoy in the future. In this one also the name of God is not found, because He being the Creator has some principles which oppose those of the day, and because He taught us to seek our true end in a different manner. He is in the way of all these notions."[41]

The young Californians certainly studied this political catechism far more thoroughly than their religious catechism.

---

[37] "Libro de Ordenes," Santa Barbara.

[38] Solá to Fr. Payéras, "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Sacramento, xviii, 436-437.

[39] "Catecismo Político Arreglado á la Constitucion de la Monarquia Española." It is a quarto of thirty-two double-columned pages. Copy in Santa Barbara Archives is in the handwriting of Fr. Narciso Duran.

[40] This is true, though the Catholic Religion by the way is given out as the State Religion in two questions and answers.

[41] Fr. Martínez to Don José de la Guerra. "De la Guerra Collection." Fr. Martínez writing to his friend uses no dates.

It would seem that they substituted the former for the latter. This and the reading of French infidel productions inflated the minds of the young men so that they imagined themselves beings of superior knowledge. They were so filled with foolish notions about the "rights of man" that the rights of their Creator or their fellowmen were not considered. This accounts for their overbearing and heartless treatment of the missionaries and Indians. Judging from the actions of Mariano Vallejo and J. B. Alvarado, for instance, who were Monterey youths at this time, they seemed to imagine that missionaries and Indians had no rights whatever. These remarks are intended to aid the reader to solve the puzzle which will present itself when we have to contemplate the part the young Californians took in the ruin of the missions. The solution is right here.

CHAPTER VII.

Mexico Independent.—Religious Orders in Mexico.—The Situation at the College.—Solá Turns Against the Fathers.—His Strange Demands.—Fr. Payéras Appeals to the College.—He Explains the Position of the Missionaries.—Their Work and Sacrifices for the Indians.—Their Sacrifices for the Troops.—Funds of the Missions.—Why the Fathers Continued in Charge.—Their Sincerity.—Bancroft's Insincerity.—Solá Excused.

THE machinations of the Spanish Córtes against the religious Orders had at last effectually estranged the American colonies from the mother country. Only a month after the publication of the iniquitous decrees, which were to smother monastic religious life in both Spain and Latin America, General Agustin Iturbide from Iguala on February 24th, 1821, issued the proclamation which set forth the necessity of independence and a new plan of government. This was the celebrated Plan de Iguala which embodied the three guaranties—Religion, Independence, and Union.[1] On September 27th Iturbide took possession of the capital. Next day Viceroy O'Donojú resigned. A regency was established with the Liberator Iturbide at its head, after a junta had declared Mexico to be a free and sovereign nation independent of Spain.[2] Unfortunately the elements of disorder and irreligion soon came to the front and controlled the government such as it was. Real freedom was not established, least of all for Religion and its representatives.

In the meantime the College of San Fernando, to which the Fathers in California looked for relief, in common with other religious communities received a taste of what was to be expected under purely Mexican rule. In a circular, one month after the declaration of independence, Fr. José Gasol announced to the California friars that he had been

---

[1] Alamán, Mejico, vol. v. 98-99; 333; and Appendix, pp. 8-13.

[2] Alamán, v, 331-339.

elected guardian by the chapter held on July 28th, and then pictured the situation as follows: "From *La Gaceta* and other papers forwarded to Your Reverences you will learn the new plan of government to which we must submit. I therefore do not stop to write concerning the decrees of the new government. What I enjoin upon you is that in everything and in every event you proceed with prudence and strive for union, peace, and tranquillity, and that you permit the infliction of wrong rather than break the bond of charity. I am not unaware, dear Fathers, of the need of missionaries in your missions, nor that some of you wish to retire to the College; but I must describe to you the deplorable condition in which the College finds itself. To-day we are not more than nineteen priests in the house. In less than three months, since the celebration of the last chapter, six priests and three lay-brothers have severed their connection with the College.[3] Most of them were from Spain. God knows those who may yet ask to leave, and when it shall be possible to procure others from Spain, supposing that the independence of Mexico is realized.[4]

"Under these circumstances, my dear Fathers and Brothers, Your Reverences will comprehend how impossible it is for me to console you by sending new laborers for the vineyard of the Lord in California. No other course is open to me, my dear Fathers, than to call upon the Lord of the vineyard, (and no more upon our Catholic monarch, as Most Rev. Fr. Truxillo said in his letter),[5] and to exhort all Your Reverences to remain in the same Rule, and to warn you that whithersoever you may go, when you leave your forced exile, you will not improve your lot. If you want to retire and come to the College, do not believe you will find it the quiet and silent retreat which it was when you departed

[3] That is to say, had returned to their provinces as they had a right to do after ten years of service.

[4] The Father doubted that independence would be lasting.

[5] He was Commissary-General of the Indies in 1792.

from here. Since the 27th of last month[6] it has been transformed into a barracks for the cavalry, whence you can infer how we are mortified by day and by night with the noise of the soldiery, the horses, dogs, and trumpets. So it is at present; what it will be later on we do not know. If you desire to return to Spain, it will be nothing less than leaving the smoke in order to leap into the flame.

"I shall in no way exaggerate, if I assure Your Reverences that the whole object of that government[7] is to put an end to the religious state and to make it despicable before the world. The decrees of suppression of the convents, the prohibition of bestowing the habit, secularization, depriving the religious of their prelates general and provincial,[8] extermination of all monks[9] and Jesuits, and lastly depriving the secular and regular clergy of their immunities, plainly manifest this; and yet we are only at the beginning. We may foretell what will be the end; and we need not hesitate to affirm that those religious who go back to Spain will find themselves the laughingstock and the objects of mockery and scorn; for so Fr. Garijo[10] told us when he returned to the college three months ago, after he had observed during his six years' stay in Spain the impiety, the contempt, and the ridicule with which the religious are covered, and how infidel freethinking has infected the lower classes.[11]

"You may therefore believe, my dear Fathers, that the

[6] On that day Iturbide's troops entered the city. They seem to have straightway quartered themselves in the monasteries. Under God-fearing leaders such places would have been the last to be molested. Under the domination of modern Latin kings officials had learnt, in an emergency, to seize the property of the Church before any other without compensation. They might have learned better from pagan nations.

[7] The Córtes of Spain. One would think Fr. Gasol was a prophet; for he is describing the plans of Canaléjas of Spain.

[8] By forbidding the religious to be guided by them.

[9] Monks were the Benedictines and other ancient Orders in contradistinction to the mendicants who were known as friars.

[10] Fr. Garijo was guardian of the College in 1811.

[11] That accounts for the freethinking Córtes.

most desirable corner at present is the one you enjoy in those remote regions, for which we entertain a holy envy against you. If my advice counts for anything, stay where conditions are nothing like those that afflict us, though there are some things that provoke resentment. They will always be more tolerable and reconcilable with the interior and exterior peace which your least Brother, who loves you in Jesus Christ, wishes you along with every consolation." [12]

The Fr. Guardian's communication went far to help the missionaries endure the vexations to which there seemed to be no end, and one source of which was the governor himself. When Solá noticed the turn things in Spain and Mexico were taking, a change seems to have come over him. At any rate, he thought it safe to organize some reforms of his own on the line of those inaugurated by the enemies of the religious in the mother country. It shows how weak the affection for religious institutions was in the bosom of the average Spanish official of even the better class. This must be attributed to the anomalous position to which the Catholic Church was reduced by Spanish royalty. According to the wild notions of state officials, either civil or military, she was the mouthpiece of God only in subjection to royalty, yea, if his majesty and the ministers desired, not as the lawful consort, but as a mere handmaid! Hence the conflicts between the king or his crafty ministers and the Church when she refused. This sentiment ran through whole officialdom, and hence the domineering attitude assumed from the king down to the last corporal or policeman and scribe. If in addition the official was tainted with infidel notions, as happened frequently, so much the worse for the Church and clergy, especially the religious, even the missionaries, notwithstanding that the latter were protected against usurpation by special laws enacted for the sake of the Indian neophytes.

Though on most friendly terms with the Fathers thus far, and even intimate with some, Solá now claimed superiority in missionary affairs, it mattered not that they did not

[12] Fr. Gasol, "Circular," October 23rd, 1821. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

concern him and were regulated by royal decrees. His attitude was the more ungrateful in view of the fact that the missionaries with their converts for years had strained every nerve to feed and clothe the troops and the families whom the government had abandoned to their fate. The missions had also supplied the weapons and ammunition to a great extent, and had furnished large sums of money, when in order to do so the neophytes were forced to go in rags and to be deprived of the rewards so dear to the childish heart of the Indian. The governor grew so persistent that Fr. Commissary Payéras found himself compelled to appeal to the viceroy through the College. In this precious document, which covers fifteen folio pages, the Fr. Comisario-Prefecto writes that the governor insists: 1. "On doing away with what he calls all arbitrariness of the missionaries, and obliging them by a general law to furnish him with exact and punctual accounts of the invoices, bills, and original lists, of the receipts and expenditures of the missions, their investments, and of whatever their storerooms and granaries contain, just like one who manages the property of the Indians as a paid official in strict justice and under formal responsibility.

2. "He demands that account should be given to him of the funds in the coffers of the mission.

3. "When he saw that the missions were not surrendered,[13] nor even a pueblo established which might be under his immediate inspection, the governor planned taking from all the missions the most clever and useful Indians in order to organize with them two pueblos, or to aggregate them to white settlements already established.

"Such, my venerable Fathers, is among others the plan of reform propounded by His Honor. By reason of the profound respect with which his humble habit inspires every Franciscan religious for established authority, I have refrained from replying to His Honor officially; but when I wrote to him in a friendly and confidential way, and sup-

[13] as demanded by the decree of the self-constituted Córtes of 1813.

plicated [14] him to exempt us from such a heavy burden, His Honor insisted. I then travelled from Soledad to remonstrate at Monterey. After discussing the subject for five hours, we agreed to await the decision of His Excellency, the viceroy, to whom the governor is to refer the question." On thirteen pages Fr. Payéras then states the position of the friars from the beginning of their work in California so that the College might represent the case intelligently before the viceroy. We can give only the most salient arguments of this masterly document.

"Our College," Fr. Payéras says, "entered Lower California and administered its missions in purely spiritual matters. When it pleased His Majesty to entrust us also with the temporalities we submitted to the yoke [15] like sons of obedience. We came up to these new reductions and we continued the ancient plan; but in order that the missions might thrive the better, and the Fathers labor more cheerfully and with less embarrassment, the Rev. Fr. Junípero Serra, then presidente, among the thirty-two points for which he petitioned the viceroy under number nine asked 'That Your Excellency inform said official [16] and his soldiers that the management, education, and chastisement of the baptized Indians and of those that desire to be baptized belong absolutely to the missionary Fathers (except in case of capital crime); so that no chastisement nor maltreatment may be inflicted upon any of them, by either officer or private soldier, without the consent of the missionary; for such has been the custom from time immemorial in the dominion since its conquest, and quite conformable to the natural law concerning the edu-

[14] The Fr. Commissary was going altogether too far in self-abasement, since he knew the law was on his side. Supplicating under such circumstances only confirmed the unjust aggressor. It proves, however, to what length the friars went for the sake of peace and their Indians.

[15] As such the friars regarded the care of the temporalities. This the preceding pages have proved beyond dispute, notwithstanding Bancroft's, Hittell's, and the mission despoilers' misrepresentations.

[16] Governor Fages. See vol. ii, sect. i, chap. viii, p. 119.

cation of children, and an essential circumstance for the instruction of the poor neophytes. This is what the illustrious inspector-general [17] ordained before he left California after he had weighed the said reasons and others which might be accumulated.' In reply His Excellency decided: 'With regard to Article Nine, that the maintenance, government, chastisement, and education of the baptized Indians should belong absolutely to the missionary Fathers, it is declared that so it must be executed in everything pertaining



Signature of Fr. Mariano Payéras.

to the management after the manner which a father of a family observes with regard to the care of the house, education and correction of his children.' [18]

"This decision of the higher authorities which appears to be generally observed in all the missions of America, has always been our shield. It has served as a barrier between us and the officials and their subordinates. With it we have maintained ourselves tranquilly without discord and in peace. Under its auspices we have founded all these missions, and under such sensible regulations they have prospered. Owing to said decison every missionary, regarding himself as the head of his grand family of 400, 800, 1000, and even 2,000 souls, added and united his stipends, donations for holy Masses, for sermons, alms, and whatever he received from other sources to the common fund. He made of his labors

---

[17] Don José de Gálvez.

[18] "A manera que un padre de familia se maneja con el cuidado de su casa, educacion y correccion de sus hijos." Solá probably thought he could safely override this plain law in view of the conditions in Spain.

and of those of his wards one grand fund which has produced the property now exaggerated out of all semblance to truth; for the wealth which the missions are supposed to possess is for the greater part fictitious or imagined, but not real. Thus the Fathers toiling along with their neophytes have reared and cultivated these missions without receiving stipends, or even payment for goods furnished to the military since the year 1810. They have lived frugally in order to be able to furnish their churches and practice charity to needy white people. They have kept the troops and their families in food and clothing since the year 1810 to the amount of half a million of dollars for which they have the drafts, but nothing more. All this the Fathers have effected with their Indians. Neither the governor nor any other tribunal has ever been able to charge them with having been guilty of defalcation. All this has been accomplished without delivering the invoices, or giving an account. Only the economy and frugality of the sons of St. Francis, and their undeniable detachment from everything worldly, which obliges them not to take or keep anything for themselves from the common fund, but to add what they can, could render this work so truly grand and prodigious. I say this, because, if we turn the eyes from the missions to the pueblos of the white settlers around us, we shall observe that they do not equal the missions even proportionately in temporal possessions, nor in contributing for the cause of the nation.

"Notwithstanding this well-known fact, the governor forsooth appears not to be aware of what the missions are doing for the welfare of the country, but wants to convert the infirm, sick, aged, exhausted, and mayhap discouraged missionaries and priests of the Propagation of the Faith into clerks, cashiers, and mere plantation managers, who, though they have not fathomed the vast depths of arithmetic, shall be bound to sink themselves into a sea of anxiety and worry lest they be held guilty or at least suspected of defalcation, or wanting in interest for others; and this, too, without stipend, without pay, without standing, without honor, and with no more recompense than distrust, censure, etc. Will there

be any Father ready to shoulder such a yoke? It has pleased the king to burden us with the care of the temporalities without demanding any other security than our well accredited religious conduct, and without more reward than that of heaven. We therefore manage them out of pure, absolutely disinterested charity. Annually we have furnished satisfactory reports to this governor, and to the ecclesiastical as well as royal Superiors. Nothing more was required. We might, indeed, surrender the temporalities, but from experience we know the evil consequences of an untimely surrender, and wise statesmen frown upon it. The Indians themselves are not disposed to manage them for themselves. To turn over the management of the temporalities to seculars would be to divide the control, and according to the opinion of officials who know whereof they speak it would mean the breaking up of the mission bond and final destruction. Hence it was that Don José de Galvez had the management of the mission temporalities restored to the religious.

"Many gentiles are now coming in troops from the Tulares and from other regions, as the report of the year proves, in order to join the missions and become Christians. How will the missionary keep them unless the goods of the community which His Majesty has entrusted to him for that very purpose be at his disposal? The Apostles baptized rational and cultured people; we receive people so crude and brutalized that it is necessary to teach them to be human beings, whom bread in the one hand, clothing in the other, coupled with exquisite patience, and above all the sweet yoke of the Gospel, alone can domesticate and tame.

"Moreover, if the white people in the territory contribute nothing because they have nothing or little (generally speaking), since being free they live as they please, what may the governor expect for his troops if such liberty be practised by detached Indians? Much assistance, surely, would he receive from them when they are removed from the mission community![19]

[19] Solá proposed taking the best and most skillful neophytes and with them organize pueblos, or to join them to white settle-

"These and other reflexions, which I omit, oblige us to retain the control of the mission temporalities for the present, notwithstanding that we missionaries, most of whom are old, infirm, and worn out, feel the burden heavily; but we are so little attached to them that at the slightest insinuation of the viceroyal government we shall surrender the keys with pleasure and thanks.[20]

"The governor tells me that the missions need nothing. This is due not to their funds, for they have none, but to careful management on the part of the Fathers, to their Franciscan self-denial, and their firmness which assist them not only to conserve but to increase the wealth of their spiritual children. However, in the beginning of this year His Honor asked me for $3000 from the missions for his artillery. In May he wanted 800 head of cattle to furnish the presidio of San Francisco with meat. In June he called for $6000 [21] for the relief of his troops. I apportioned this among the missions, and they delivered their shares to the governor. Like all the white people of the territory he appears to believe that the wealth and money of the missions are without limit. I have heard as much during all the twenty-six years of my ministry here. Yet which are the funds and revenues of these missions with which to answer the governor's second demand for money?

"The only assets are the stipends of the friars, which for me during the twenty-six years of my ministry amounted to $10,400, but which I have never seen or touched, because the

---

ments. An unlawful and most insane project. The result would be just what Fr. Payéras predicted, and which was experienced at the time of the confiscation.

[20] "Estámos tan poco apegados á ellas (bienes), que á la menor insinuacion de la Superioridad entregaremos con gusto y gracias las llaves.

[21] Solá, September 27th, 1821, reported that he had borrowed $6000 from Fr. Prefecto Payéras to be repaid from future custom duties. "Cal. Arch.," Presidios & Missions, Miscellanea. There is no evidence that this money was ever refunded. Solá was hardly ever able to do so.

money[22] was converted into goods for the mission by our síndico in Mexico. The same is true of the other Fathers according to the longer or shorter time of service. With this investment, aided by the industry of the missionaries and neophytes, the missions were improved and kept in repair, the fields were cleared and cultivated, live-stock raised, and manufactures carried on. Of the product of the farms and stock the governor annually receives the same exact reports as the king and the College. That does not satisfy him; he wants to know every other little revenue. At the memorable meeting of five hours I asked him to whom the property of the missions belonged? To the Indians, he replied. Well, then, said I, if the missionary with the Indians constitutes a family, according to the declaration of the king, and neither the king, nor the viceroy, nor any one else demands of any family to state how it invests what belongs to it, why then should the missionary, the head of the family, do so? He replied that it was necessary in order to know what contributions to levy. I insisted that no corporate body for the purpose of imposing contributions inquires of any man how much money he has in his purse, or the amount of the funds in his coffers, but about his chattels, live-stock, and landed property, and levies the contribution according to his appraisement. Why then put such question to the Indian? Though there are in the territory about 4000 white people, not counting the troops, who have more or less property, from no one as far as known, for the sake of levying contributions, has such information been exacted, but only of the Indian just because he is governed by a missionary Father, and since the Father governs with order and economy the Indian is put on a level with the whites whenever they have need of anything Indian; but he is not considered whenever there is question of anything pertaining to the vaunting white man.

"Inasmuch as the property of the thousand and more neophytes is massed together, those who view it with other eyes are filled with envy to see it so prosperous, because well

[22] Rather $4400 of this amount; for the last eleven years neither he nor the other Fathers received any goods.

managed. Most of the missions have no more than from $100 to $1000 in money. Three or four may scarcely have $4000. They need all this for their daily subsistence, salary of the mayordomos, opportune purchases, requests from the governor, drafts for their memorias, and because it is part of orderly and prudent economy to remember the morrow to-day. Now what is that much money for a thousand and more owners in each mission, even though the missionary be excluded? For he is satisfied with a little coarse sack cloth woven by a rude neophyte. Let us not overlook the fact. That money is the blood of the Indian who dresses himself in coarse cloth, who eats wheat or corn cooked without salt or lard, and who maintains himself, the church and the rest just because he lives under the rule of the missionary. If, however, the missionary, harassed and exhausted with as many demands as there are inhabitants in the territory, who all flock to the missionary for succor, should allot to each one of his spiritual children what is coming to him, what would be the share of each one? Very little would fall to him of the common wealth which is so much exaggerated.

"The third point in the governor's plan is to take the best and most expert mission Indians, who are the consolation and the right hand of the missionaries, with whose aid the Fathers govern and sustain the missions in a prosperous state, and form with them a pueblo in the north and another in the south, or add them to the white population in the existing pueblos. This really means that the Indian, who is free and the master of his own actions like every Spaniard, for having been a good man at the mission and learned this or that art or trade, has in the eyes of the governor become so guilty that he is in his country, in his house, and among his relatives unworthy of his most precious treasure, and must therefore be banished by order of the governor and placed among another people with another language, against his will and inclination, twenty-five, fifty, or one hundred leagues away from his native soil!

"Forasmuch as this plan is opposed to the royal laws and the late legislation under the new Constitution, on hearing it

from the governor, I replied with feeling: 'Sir, if Your Honor wants to organize pueblos according to law, there are already as many of them as there are missions in the territory under your jurisdiction. You need but change the name. The missions do not have to continue forever; they must endure only so long as is necessary to transform them with success into civilized pueblos. If just now we do not surrender the missions, which we have created and which we control, it is not because of a blind affection for them, much less for their property. It is due to prudent reasons which Your Honor has heard from us on various occasions;[23] but if Your Honor have another opinion, you may propose it as you please to the viceroy upon whose decision we depend. In proof of our apostolic indifference, I may state, that in December 1818, by order of our College, I wrote to the Bishop of Sonora, that if it appeared to him evident that these missions were in the desired condition, he would be pleased to appoint secular priests as the law authorizes.' I have said the same to His Honor and asked him to bring it to the consideration of the viceroy.[24]

"As men dead to the world we do not seek its goods; only through necessity do we live in the midst of them. We desire only the souls for Jesus Christ. On the day when competent authority shall declare these missions secularized[25] and formally civilized pueblos, this honorable body of mis-

[23] The chief reasons were that the Indians could not be trusted to work unless compelled, and that they could not manage the community property.

[24] Notwithstanding these plain words Bancroft, vol. ii, 435, 437, has the hardihood to declare that the Fathers were not sincere, but held on to the property in order to keep in power! The fact is they loathed the position of manager of temporal affairs; Bancroft's assertion flies into the very face of the facts; but what else can be expected of a man who regards the dollar mark as the sign of salvation.

[25] That is to say, put in charge of secular priests regarding spiritual affairs, and the property in control of Indian officials elected by the Indians. This was the meaning of the Act of the Córtes of 1813. The act which the later mission despoilers dubbed "Secularization" was confiscation in the true sense of the word.

sionaries of the Propagation of the Faith will withdraw from their supervision, and will devote itself to fresh apostolic fields in the north and east, where Indians anxiously await us, in order to toil and suffer anew. Meanwhile, if the governor is aware of any defect, excess, or abuse on our part, especially with regard to the temporalities, he may notify the Fr. Commissary Prefect; the fault will then be immediately corrected." [26]

"Thus argued the missionary chief," Bancroft remarks, "with an eloquence impossible to render in a résumé, and with an earnestness seemingly out of all proportion to the importance of the question raised by Solá's simple and not oppressive demand." [27] Bancroft, like all Liberals and materialists, must hold that oppression is not oppression at all as long as Catholic religious are the victims. We should like to see what action he would take if some such officer like Solá had made the same demand upon the Bancroft business concern. The governor's three propositions attacked the relations of the missionaries with the converts in their vitals, and aimed at reducing the Fathers to the position of mere clerks and overseers. They "could manifest a cheerful acquiescence in a project involving the total secularization of their establishments," as the same historian correctly says, but they refused to allow themselves to be reduced to the state of menials among their converts. They stood in relation to their wards as parents towards their children, according to the decrees of the Spanish Kings. As long as these royal laws remained in force, so long the Fathers insisted on their observance for the good of the neophytes.

Yet Solá was really a friend of the missionaries; but the troubles during the last eleven years when no aid had come from the government seemed to have caused him to go daft. Payéras himself excuses the governor. "I do not wish to omit the reasons why the governor proposed his articles," he writes in his long memorial. "We have in the territory at present seven companies of troops without counting the bat-

[26] Fr. Payéras, "Memorial," June 18th, 1821. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[27] Bancroft, ii, 435.

tery of artillery and the arsenal. From Mexico since the year 1810 almost nothing has come for their support. The governor wants to procure it all from the missions alone, because from the whites, who could give but little, only tithes are exacted. Hence the many projects to make ends meet."[28] In his fretful mood Solá failed to acknowledge that the missionaries were making every effort to assist him; he erroneously presumed that they possessed unlimited wealth which they were concealing, whereas through industry and economy they contrived to barely keep afloat.[29]

---

[28] Fr. Payéras, "Memorial," ut supra.

[29] The foolish notion that the Fathers had unlimited wealth, nay, gold or silver mines which they concealed, was common among the Mexicans of those days, and it exists among their descendants to the present time. The only mines they possessed were their conscientiousness, industry, economy, abstemiousness. If the enemies of the Fathers had possessed these qualities, they too would have had something to sustain them in the days of need.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Missions Supporting the Military.—Fr. Payéras's Circulars.—Fr. Cortés in Vain Tries to Cash the Drafts.—Fathers Catalá and Viader Remonstrate.—Contributions of Santa Clara.—Demand of the Comandante of San Diego.—Fr. Gil's Touching Appeal.—The California Settlers and Their Characteristics.—Dramshops at Santa Barbara.—Missions Exempt from Taxation.—Governor Solá.—Insists on Taxing the Neophytes.—Spanish Laws Concerning Indian Converts.—Practice of Spanish Monarchs.—Solá's High-handed Commands.—Injustice of His Proceedings.

DESTITUTION meanwhile continued to afflict the troops and their families. As in years past the idle soldiery relied on the industry, economy, and generosity of the missionaries. The missions accordingly furnished them with clothing and provisions which were often sorely needed for the neophytes. "From them," Bancroft confesses, "were obtained food and other articles for actual consumption, contributions of produce for trade with foreign vessels, laborers for presidio work, cattle for the company ranchos, and even advances of money. Only in one instance did a padre protest to his prelate; while the Fr. Prefect seemed to vie with the governor in his zeal for collecting supplies."[1]

Thus during the year 1821 alone, as far as we have discovered, the Fr. Prefecto, urged by Governor Solá on various dates, issued the following circulars in aid of the military:

January 25th, for voluntary contributions of clothing, each mission being apportioned a certain quantity.[2]

January 31st for a donation of $3000 in money to repair the arsenal and presidio of Monterey. The share of the poorest mission, Soledad, was $25. "It is a great object," Fr.

---

[1] Bancroft, ii, 435-436.

[2] "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1202; 1214.

Payéras wrote to the Fathers, "and concerns the whole nation and each individual in the territory." [3]

March 3rd Fr. M. Payéras asked the missionaries to furnish sixty Indian laborers and mechanics to help rebuild the Monterey presidio.[4]

April 28th he issued a circular for more laborers.[5]

August 24th Fr. Payéras directed the Fathers of the four southernmost missions to furnish the presidio of San Diego with ten mules and complete outfit.[6]

October 10th he asked for more aid in behalf of Monterey presidio from the missions pertaining to that jurisdiction.[7]

In consequence of another circular dated November 7th Mission San José, for instance, sent to the presidio of San Francisco $400 worth of corn, $100 worth of beans, $105 worth of blankets, $118 worth of shoes, $55 worth of serge, and $43 worth of sundries. Other missions contributed similarly.[8]

Money contributions, labor of Indians, and other supplies called for by circulars were regarded as donations for which no drafts were given. In reality they were forced taxes which often weighed heavily on the respective missions. In return for supplies furnished the troops at the request of the commanders checks or drafts were issued on the royal treasury.[9] Fr. Juan Cortés, the procurator of the College, endeav-

[3] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1191. In the previous year the missionaries of the twenty missions could scrape together only $2000. Solá to Fr. Payéras, December 16th, 1820. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1107; "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Sacramento, xviii, 449-450. Fr. Payéras to Solá, December 19th. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1109. Solá to Fr. Payéras, December 28th, 1820. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Sacramento, xviii, 452-455.

[4] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1205.

[5] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1212.

[6] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1247.

[7] Solá to Fr. Payéras, October 4th; Fr. Payéras, October 10th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1249; 1250.

[8] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1252.

[9] Solá to Fr. Payéras in May 1821 says that the missions to date had received $400,000 in drafts for supplies furnished the troops. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Sacramento, xviii, 482-487.

ored to cash these drafts. In a letter to Fr. M. Payéras he relates his experience. "I have received," he says on September 27th, 1820, "along with your letters of May 22nd and June 25th the drafts amounting to $10,644.50. They are filed away until God wills otherwise; for the payment of money is as poor as ever, not for want of efforts on our part; there are enough made in vain. The government has repeatedly ordered that they should be paid here or at Guadalajara, and now at Zacatecas; but nothing is paid. The inference is that these orders are issued merely to quiet us." [10] Again on July 27th, 1821, he writes to Fr. J. Señan: "The viceroy has given orders to the administrator of the Pious Fund to pay us annually by installments what the revenues can bear; but as the Pious Fund consists of plantations which by reason of the insurrection produce little, and the Spanish dominion is in a critical state, the cry of independence being general, nothing can be expected. He also directed the payment of $3000 every month to satisfy our claim on stipends from the year 1811 on; but the reply was that the Fund had nothing with which to pay. God remedy so many evils." [11]

The only Father who "protested," as Bancroft puts it, against furnishing so many supplies for mere drafts was



Signature of Fr. Magin Catalá.

Fr. José Viadér of Santa Clara, the companion of the saintly Fr. Magin Catalá. Writing to Fr. Payéras on December 10th, 1821, Fr. José complained bitterly about the demands of the governor. The chief reason appears to have been that the soldiers, as he says, were inconsiderate and not content with the necessaries of life, and often coupled their demands with threats. No matter how much the Fathers exerted them-

[10] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[11] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

selves, the ungrateful troops would always grumble.[12] At the beginning of the same year Fr. Viadér had set forth the straitened circumstances of Santa Clara Mission by reporting, "We have been unable to give Sergeant Pico more than $25 of the $150 allotted by the Fr. Prefecto."[13] Even in the preceding year Fathers Catalá and Viadér jointly had to remonstrate with Governor Solá. Among other things they said: "At this mission there is a scarcity of cattle. Last year (1819) we had to appeal to Mission San Juan Bautista for an alms in order that our neophytes might have food; and this year we shall probably have to do the same thing. This year the providing of clothes for our neophytes was delayed until last month, owing to the fact that we had to supply the troops so much, and not less the wretched colonists.[14] We assure Your Honor that, on account of the present needs and the lack of clothing, we have made and are making extraordinary sacrifices. If now, at the time of sowing, cleaning up, repairing houses and fences, making tiles, adobes, etc., the Indians are to haul your cannon to the beach, to take out lumber and shelter it at the mission,[15] we shall be ruined. If now, be-

---

[12] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1255. To this lament Bancroft makes the brutal remark, "Evidently the friars were being 'squeezed' for their desire to hold on to the temporalities" (vol. ii, 436). It is the Indians who were "squeezed." For their sake the friars managed the property when instead they longed to be able to pursue their true calling of messengers of the Gospel, otherwise the Indians would have been fleeced not only out of their temporalities, but out of existence. What fanatical bigotry Bancroft displays! Where is the evidence that the friars desired to hold on to the temporalities? It is all the other way. Neither the secular nor the ecclesiastical authorities had as yet asked the friars to relinquish their charge; the friars had offered to retire, but their offer was not accepted. Yet Bancroft boasts of writing history as he finds it!

[13] "No hemos podido entregar al Sr. Pico mas que 25 pesos de los 150 que nos señaló el R. P. Prefecto." Fr. Viadér to Solá, January 22nd, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1310.

[14] at the town of San José. The inhabitants were a shiftless set.

[15] This is what Solá had demanded, though the soldiers could have done it themselves, or the colonists could have been enlisted.

sides supplying 300 blankets and 300 yards of serge to the troops alone, not counting the very many pieces of both kinds of goods furnished the needy people of the adjoining town of San José, we must produce forty more for the infantry, we shall have to overwork the unfortunate neophytes whose lot is to go naked.

"In addition to what has been said, this Mission of Santa Clara has provided the troops with 300 pairs of shoes, forty saddles, more than 200 soft-tanned calf skins, and many other articles which require time and labor, not to speak of all the corn and beans which are raised and the fat which can be collected. Of the three products mentioned we use no part for the Indians.[16] Besides this the raising and transporting of all the garvanzos, peas, and other things is a most heavy and almost insurmountable burden for these unhappy Christians.[17] Your Honor will please not doubt our special interest in the spiritual and temporal welfare of the territory, nor our desires and extraordinary sacrifices for the preservation and defense of this country; but how, Sir, can we do all this? Besides the goods which are needed for the artillery of San Francisco, this mission will furnish a hundredweight of iron from the little there is, and we hope to give another hundredweight when the transport arrives from Guaymas. Steel we have none. The rest: charcoal, brick, mortar, etc., may be prepared at the presidio. Other goods, save hemp, we have not. This mission lacks very many agricultural implements and

---

[16] Because all had to be delivered to the troops to satisfy their ceaseless demands.

[17] So-called historians and other writers, prompted by the mission despoilers, have claimed that the friars overworked and starved the Indians. If anything of the kind was ever reported truthfully it was the result of demands on them which they could never satisfy. Fathers Viadér and Catalá only voice the situation at all the missions. The grief at having to overwork the Indians on account of the soldiers breathes from every line they write on the subject. The wonder is that any of the neophytes remained. It was due to nothing else than affection for the missionaries who endeavored to lighten the burdens which they could not remove. The said letter is proof of it.

many other things, but we suffer the want, because there is here no human aid, and the necessities and evils are general. Therefore, Your Honor, we appeal to your well-known goodness and justice, and beseech you with all due respect, to free this mission in our charge from said burdens and additional ones. In case Your Honor should insist on having us perform all those tasks mentioned, we hope that you will not take it ill that the command therefor should come through the Fr. Prefect, our prelate; in that case our conscience may rest tranquil." It is pleasant to note, that on receipt of this appeal Governor Solá wrote on the margin that he was satisfied.[18]

The commanders of the presidio sometimes made additional demands without consulting the governor. For instance, José Maria Estudillo of San Diego on June 15th, 1821, wanted Mission San Juan Capistrano to furnish 500 fanégas of corn and 120 fanégas of beans; Mission San Luis Rey was to provide 652 fanégas of corn and 200 fanégas of beans; poor San Diego Mission was directed to forward 200 fanégas of corn and 44 fanégas of beans.[19] In reply Fr. Peiri of San Luis Rey wrote thus: "In less than a month Estudillo has already received $70 worth of corn and beans. Nevertheless we shall not only comply, but we promise, that even though there existed no other grain at the mission than that which was demanded, we would give cheerfully to the last grain, so that the troops might not suffer and the patriotism which we have always possessed appear in deed." [20] To the Fr. Commissary, however, Fathers Peiri and Escudé could not help revealing that Estudillo's request was heavily felt, as their mission was the most populous.[21] They thought that it should be left to the missionaries to decide

[18] Fathers Catalá and Viadér to Solá, May 3rd, 1820. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1087.

[19] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1223.

[20] Fr. Peiri to Estudillo, June 18th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1226. "no solo nos conformamos, sino . . . dariamos gustosos hasta el último grano."

[21] San Luis Rey in 1821 contained more than 2000 neophytes.

what quantity they could spare. Besides the presidio ought to at least send the pack-mules, as was done elsewhere.[22]

Another Father who seemed to be at his wits' end by reason of orders for supplies for which he received nothing but drafts, on which he could realize nothing to clothe his neophytes, was Fr. Luis Gil y Taboada of Mission Santa Cruz. In a letter to Fr. Payéras he says: "There is little wool on hand, and the Indians suffer very much from snow and cold. The cattle have no young. Last year the mission furnished fourteen saddles as you directed. This year it gave $51 worth of beans and 207 arróbas of fat. I have given seventy pairs of shoes; there were no more. Now on bended knees I beg Your Reverence through the Blood of Jesus Christ and for the sake of the Blessed Virgin Mary to grant me permission to retire to the College.[23] There is nothing new save that my leg begins to trouble me, but not so as to prevent me from celebrating holy Mass. The year has proved one of the worst. For days we have been praying for rain. For the last fifteen days they have been irrigating the soil to be able to plow it, but to little purpose."[24] Similar conditions prevailed at most other missions, so that the desire of those old missionaries to be rid of the burden of having to worry about temporal affairs was quite intelligible, and certainly sincere, Bancroft to the contrary notwithstanding.

What then was the white population doing to render life for the missionaries so burdensome? "The whites in California were known as the 'gente de razon' or people of intelligence. The expression indicated," says Hittéll,[25] "that

---

[22] Fathers Peiri and Escudé, June 22nd, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1227.

[23] "Ahora hincado de rodillas pido á V. Reverencia, por la Sangre de Jesu Cristo, por Maria Santisima, se digne de darme el retiro para mi Colegio." His petition could not be granted. He died at San Luis Obispo, December 15th, 1833.

[24] Fr. Gil to Fr. Payéras, November 24th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1253.

[25] "History of California," ii, 470-472. Hittell makes up his description from the various authorities mentioned in the text.

the red men were popularly considered creatures inferior to reasoning beings and more nearly on the level with brutes; and its general use in this sense, significant as it was not only of the way in which the Indians were regarded, but also of the way in which they were treated, was no less degrading to the whites than to the Indians themselves. Of the so-called native Californians, meaning thereby the Californian descendants of Spanish and Mexican blood, there were several distinct classes. The upper class consisted mostly of those who were, or had been, in official station. There were only a few families of them; but they were very aristocratic in their feelings and intermarried only among themselves. They were therefore all more or less closely related to one another. They prided themselves upon what they called their Castilian blood and speech, and were, in general, lighter in complexion, more intelligent and better educated than the other classes. From the upper class there were regular gradations downward, tolerably well indicated by color, growing more and more dark and muddy until the dull black hue and Tartar features of the pure Indian were reached. Generally speaking, each person's caste was decided by the quality of the blood which he carried, or was supposed to carry, in his veins. Pure blood was exceedingly rare; most of even the proudest and haughtiest families had Indian characteristics; but a very small admixture of Spanish was sufficient to entitle an individual to call himself "Español" and to reach the upper class, if he had the brains or the luck.[26]

"With the exception of the upper class, the Californians were in general low, lazy, ignorant and addicted to intoxication. The so-called Californian colonists were hardly ever seen cultivating the earth or doing any kind of useful labor. If visited upon their ranchos, they were sure to be found lying in the shade, smoking cigarritos or drinking aguardiente. If they had occasion to go any distance, however short, they never thought of walking, but mounted a horse. Few of them could read or write. They were in-

[26] Dana, "Two Years Before the Mast," p. 87. Edition 1895.

veterate gamblers; and drunkenness was so common that it was rare to meet one without his bottle. Like Indians, they allowed the women to do almost all the work in the way of gardening and agriculture. In general intelligence and moral qualities the women were, as a rule, much superior to the men.[27]

"One great reason of the general idleness and indolence was the fact that the Californians were all of the military class or children of the military class, who regarded any kind of personal labor except in war as degrading. Vancouver, as far back as 1793, was informed that to support the standing of the soldier in the eyes of the natives and to insure him their respect, it was deemed highly improper to subject him to any laborious employment; and he believed this circumstance alone sufficient to account for the habitual want of industry observed in the country.[28] Dana in 1835 pronounced the Californians an idle and thriftless people, who could make nothing for themselves. Though the country abounded in grapes, they purchased at a high price a bad wine made in Boston; and, instead of working up the hides of the country, they paid exorbitant rates for Yankee shoes, probably made out of California material which had therefore been twice carried around the Horn. There was no artisan class in the country. Every rich man acted the grandee, and every poor one the broken down gentleman. It was not an uncommon thing to see a man of fine figure and courtly manners, dressed in broad cloth and velvet and seated on a horse completely covered with trappings, without a *reál* in his pocket and absolutely suffering for want of something to eat.[29] Robinson gave substantially the same testimony, pronouncing the men indolent, addicted to many vices and caring little for the welfare of their children who were allowed to grow up, like themselves, unworthy members of society; that notwithstanding the immense number of domestic animals in the country, the Californians were too

[27] After Duflot de Mofras, "Exploration," vol. ii, 21-23.

[28] Vancouver, "Voyage of Discovery," vol. iv, 406.

[29] Dana, 84, 85.

lazy to make butter or cheese, and that even milk was rare. A sloth might as well be expected to leave a tree that had an inch of bark left upon its trunk, as to expect one of them to labor whilst a *reál* glistened in his pocket.[30] Wilkes noticed that while there was a little good soap and leather occasionally found, the people were too indolent to make them in any quantity, and that no other country in the world consumed so much intoxicating liquor in proportion to its population."[31]

The charges of drunkenness we find corroborated in a complaint which Fr. Francisco Suñer of Santa Barbara addressed to Governor Solá on January 26th, 1820. "Every day," he tells the governor, "we see men drunk as well from among those who call themselves people of intelligence as from the Indians to whom intelligence is denied, because in this presidial town and immediate neighborhood there are six or seven taverns where brandy is sold, or to speak more accurately every one, who has a mind to, sells it in spite of the orders which Your Honor has issued. When I complained to the temporary commander, whilst Moraga was absent on an expedition, about the case of a drunken Indian,



Signature of Fr. Francisco Suñer.

he replied that he found things as they were and that he would leave them so. The commander of San Diego, said I, would not return such an answer. During the seven or eight years in which I served at San Juan Capistrano and San Luis Rey only one tavern was found there. The commander's father-in-law assured me that when he had one or two barrels left of the vintage the commander would not let

[30] Robinson, "Life in California," 73; 142; 220.

[31] Wilkes, "Narrative," vol. v, 159.

him sell the liquor in the neighborhood of the presidio. Of what then shall those people that have brandy shops live? the temporary commander here exclaimed. To this unseasonable retort I did not want to reply, but I in turn exclaimed, 'What! are we all to perish that those brandy sellers may live! Cannot we live without having the presidio full of drunkards? Is it necessary, in order that those brandy dealers have temporal life, that the others should die spiritually? that they should ruin and damn themselves? If there were only one such tavern where all would have to go who are determined to drink, it could be better known to whom to give the liquor and to whom to deny it according to the character of the person; but with a den here and a den there no one wants to take the blame for a case of intoxication, for every one will claim that he did not cause the intoxication. From many little drinks, however, taken at so many visits to those many houses of hell, there is made of the wise man a fool, of a human being a brute, and of a Christian a scandal.' "[32]

The only sources, outside the missions, from which the governor might then expect any revenues were the diezmos and the custom duties. The former were ecclesiastical tithes due from the faithful to the bishop of the diocese. The Bishop of Sonora, for a consideration, had ceded these dues to the king, and it was therefore in California collected from the pueblos of Los Angeles, San José, and Branciforte by government officials, but as the settlers, especially those of the two last-named colonies, consisted of a shiftless class, little was derived from them. The income from the custom-houses also proved wholly inadequate to satisfy the endless demands of the idle troops.

Indian missions under the laws of Spain for a certain period, which might be extended indefinitely, were exempt from paying taxes or custom duties, particularly for church goods, which always entered free; for it was deemed imprudent and unjust to burden the convert aborigines, who voluntarily subjected themselves to Spanish domination, until they had

[32] Fr. Suñer to Solá, January 26th, 1820. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1140.

been judged capable of managing the property accumulated under the guidance of missionaries, and the latter had been supplanted by secular priests. Nevertheless, the missions of California, though under another title, had been severely taxed from the year 1811, inasmuch as during that period they had borne the weight of supporting the entire government and the troops as well as their families by furnishing produce, live-stock and manufactured goods to the amount of nearly $500,000. In return for their unselfish efforts to raise this exorbitant tax, for practically it was nothing else, the friars in charge of the missions were repaid with ingratitude by the shiftless soldiers, and even accused of secretly accumulating wealth which they would not share with the "needy and well-deserving defenders of the country."

The governor himself was misled by the envious settlers and military to take this absurd view. If he had but studied the annual mission reports and compared them with what he received from the missions through their stewards, the missionary Fathers, in cash and in mission products, Solá would have discovered the baselessness of such a charge. However, the governor at this time, 1821, was about sixty-one years of age. Worry about the deplorable condition of the territory had begun to affect his health and caused him to become irascible, unreasonable, and suspicious.[33] Surrounded as he was by indolent soldiers, worthless settlers, and unreliable officials, who, knowing it was safe, and might be profitable to do so, dinned it into Solá's ears that the friars were rolling in wealth and fared sumptuously, he began to distrust even these most loyal friends. Thus on January 16th, he wrote to José de la Guerra of Santa Barbara that he had heard of arbitrary acts on the part of the Fathers, of their excesses in buying goods for speculation which

[33] In his passion he was known to have used the cane, and no one dared to resist him. (Hittell, ii, 54.) October 16th, 1821, Solá complained of the difficulty of finding honest men, who were at the same time intelligent enough to properly attend to the collections. Even Bandini with his honeyed manner and apparent honesty had been known to smuggle. Bancroft, ii, 439.

were pretended to be for the missions; shipping liquors and other merchandise under the head of gifts, etc., that they were not scrupulous; that it was well to watch them and look after the interests of the nation; and that he was determined to make them pay duties on everything.[34] The Fathers, waving the rights of their neophytes, would gladly have paid duty on imports and exports, if that would have relieved their missions of other contributions; but Solá wanted them to contribute one half of the produce, which they sold, to the presidios, and to accept drafts with which they could purchase nothing, and which already amounted to nearly half a million dollars with no prospects of ever receiving a penny, and of the other half they should pay taxes and duties!

"I have knowledge," he writes to Captain Luis Argüello of San Francisco on March 21st, 1821, "that the Rev. Fathers of missions Santa Clara and San José refused to give half the value of the grain which they traded to the Russian corvette, thinking perhaps that I want them to donate the total value to the troops under my command. Make them understand, Sir, in my name, that what I want is aid for said troops; and if they do not like to donate it after the example of other missions, they may charge it to this military company. Tell them also that in the whole Spanish territory there is no person, no matter how privileged, exempt from paying taxes to the State, as is manifest from the New Constitution which we have sworn and from the royal decrees to which the wise Córtes agreed, and yet these missions have not contributed one *reál* of said taxes; but it seems to me that they will by and by begin to do so."[35]

A month later Solá himself undertook to lecture the Fr. Commissary Prefect and the other friars on the duties of

---

[34] Bancroft, ii, 438.

[35] "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xvii, 199-200. This was a surprising statement in view of the fact that he and his troops had lived on what the missions contributed for the last ten years. Solá was going daft, truly.

citizens,[36] and went to the verge of insult in that he charged them with a disposition to defraud the royal treasury. He then announced that the ship Santa Rita was expected, and that the missions would be required to pay $6000 or $8000 on her inward and outward-bound cargo.[37] Fr. Payéras in a dignified reply quoted Article 339 of the *Recopilacion* which demonstrated that Indian missions were exempt from paying duties or furnishing invoices.[38] As early as January 30th, 1607, King Philip III. had indeed issued a decree which exempted newly-baptized Indians from paying taxes for a term of ten years. In a letter of December 5th, 1608, the King repeated and emphasized the provision "that those Indians, who through the sole means of the preaching of the Gospel submit to our holy Faith and obedience to me, shall not be held to pay taxes for ten years."[39]

All the missions of California, except San Rafael, had been founded more than ten years, and therefore it would seem that their neophytes had forfeited the privilege. Solórzano, the standard author on Indian affiairs, however, points out that, though in many provinces the Indians could not properly be called neophytes, because they and their parents already had been baptized for a longer period, yet, inasmuch as many of their kith and kin still remained unconverted, and in order to strengthen the converted in the Religion, it was deemed expedient to interpret the privilege of immunity from taxes in their favor, after the example of St. Paul, who writes, "We have not used this power" (of accepting support); "but we bear all things, lest we should give any hindrance to the Gospel of Christ,"[40] that is to say, as the

[36] A remarkable proceeding, inasmuch as no one had proved more dutiful and law-abiding than the friars; no one as generous and unselfish.

[37] Bancroft, ii, 438.

[38] Fr. Payéras to Solá, May 16th, 1821. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1216.

[39] "Que los Indios que se redujeren de nuevo á nuestra santa Fe y obediencia mia, por solo el medio de la predicacion del Evangelio, no paguen tributo por diez años." Solórzano, "Politica Indiana," tom. i, lib. ii, cap. xx, no. 51, p. 166.

[40] I Cor. ix, 12.

CHURCH AND PLAZA OF SAN FERNANDO, CITY OF MEXICO.

standard commentator Calmet explains, "We suffered necessity, hunger, thirst, infirmity, and penury, in order to avoid the reproach with which malice might be able to discredit our ministry."[41] This was the noble view adopted by the Spanish sovereigns, and therefore they allowed such Indians to be regarded as neophytes until the missions were secularized, that is to say, until the bishop had replaced the missionaries from religious Orders with secular priests, and until the management of the temporalities accumulated under the guidance of the missionaries had been placed into the hands of the Christianized and supposedly sufficiently civilized Indians; for that is the only kind of secularization contemplated by the Spanish Kings and statesmen before they had emancipated themselves from the divine law. Even the shady Córtes of 1813 had no other manner of secularization in view.

"In our case," says the author of the *Gobierno de los Regulares,*[42] "this condescension is quite conformable to reason and piety. Thus by means of the kind methods of which those men, so experienced in the ministry, availed themselves, the Indians were fortified and disposed for the light yoke which had to be imposed, without giving them occasion or reason to abandon the obligation which all perhaps have already contracted through the holy Sacrament of Baptism, or to return to the depth of their wretchedness, and end their lives with the disgraceful brand of apostasy, which danger to all the recently converted has been observed by many. If in some missions, at the end of ten years, it has not been possible to prepare all alike for the reception of Baptism, neither His Majesty nor the Supreme Council of the Indies is inexorable, but will readily prolong the period, so that they may continue under the sole direction of the missionaries. In Paraguay a royal decree allows the Indians to remain in charge of the missionaries for twenty years. I understand that whenever a people is so rude and so slow to grasp the ineffable mysteries of the Faith, so

[41] Solórzano, tom. i, lib. ii, cap. xxii, no. 28, p. 175.

[42] Fr. Pedro José Parras, O. F. M., tom. ii, nos. 414-415.

indolent and unwilling to apply itself to labor and agriculture, that during the said period it could not adapt itself to the laws and customs of civilized societies,[43] the Council of the Indies will kindly consult the king with a view to extend the term. Our Catholic monarchs have given such manifest evidence that they seek not earthly gains but souls,[44] that they will never hesitate to concede all the time deemed necessary, lest the solid foundation for a Christian life, which they desire, be rendered impossible."

Nor was there any evidence that even the Córtes of 1820 intended to include such Indians in the general law, because it was the rule to enact special laws in their favor. At any rate, it was not the governor's right to decide when such Indians were in a condition to pay taxes.[45] In the present case Solá's action was the more inconsiderate as the resources of the Indian missions had already been drained to uphold the government and the military for the last ten years, so that the missionaries were at a loss to know how to furnish more supplies without ruin to their neophytes. In view of the changes in Spain and Mexico, however, the governor found it quite safe to disregard such reflexions as well as royal enactments. For excuse he informed the viceroy that he had read in some newspapers printed at the capital that the Córtes, with the approval of King Ferdinand VII., had resolved that in the Spanish monarchy there should be no person privileged not to pay the taxes and contributions assigned or to be assigned for the support of the State; and "that inasmuch as in this territory under my charge there is to the present day no tax nor contribution

[43] Such was the case in California where no term of years was ever urged by the Spanish rulers.

[44] Unfortunately, it must be said that Fr. Parras is too much given to laud the Kings of Spain. Moreover he wrote before 1783. The later kings and their ministers hardly considered the welfare of souls when there was question of temporal gain or politics.

[45] If the missions had received cash for the supplies furnished to the troops instead of worthless drafts they would have been in a position to pay any reasonable tax.

imposed upon the nineteen missions and the Asistencia of San Rafael with their 20,495 Indians of both sexes, with whom the religious of the College of San Fernando cultivate the soil, raise live-stock, and weave cloth by means of which the missionaries and their neophytes support themselves, and supply the troops with provisions and other things, and at the same time trade with the ships that arrive at these ports, and also send mission products to their síndico at Tepíc, who in turn procures for them the goods they desire: I have determined, until I receive instructions from Your Excellency as to whether or not these contributions should be levied, that they shall pay duties equally with other persons, though it is true that they have so far furnished supplies to the value of about $400,000." [46]

This was a rather high-handed proceeding in view of the fact that the king forbade levying taxes upon Indians without his permission. When Solá's communication reached Mexico, the viceroy had been supplanted by a regency which had declared Mexico independent of Spain, so that the governor had nothing, but the Fathers everything to fear. He therefore haughtily wrote to Fr. Payéras,[47] "Let it be understood that every one of the nineteen missions under my command must contribute to the support of the poor soldiers," as though they had not exhausted themselves for that purpose since 1811. Captain Argüello of San Francisco was instructed "that the missions of his jurisdiction, the rancheros, and soldiers without distinction may sell to foreigners who arrive at the port for the purpose of trading, but the missions, as well as those named, shall be bound to pay six per cent. on all goods procured until the annual allowances for the troops shall arrive. The missions shall be reimbursed if the viceroy should declare the missions exempt."[48] The right way would have been to

[46] Solá to the viceroy, no date. "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xvii, 540-544.

[47] Solá to Fr. Payéras, December 29th, 1821. "Cal. Arch.," Pres. & Mis., Miscellanea, p. 521.

[48] Solá to Argüello. "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xvii, 274.

await the decision of the viceroy before taxing the missions in that manner.

The missionaries submitted in behalf of their neophytes, and agreed to accept drafts for the contributions thus levied. Instead of the *Santa Rita* the *San Francisco Javier* arrived in December with a much smaller cargo, so that the amount levied on the missions was only $3000 instead of the $6000 Solá demanded. The poorer missions paid their share in tallow. Fr. Sarriá, however, protested to the last against the levy on the ground that it was against the rights of the neophytes.[49]

The ex-commissary was undoubtedly right. As long as the laws favoring the Indians were not abrogated by the rightful lawgiver, be he king or Córtes or Congress, it was not within the province of a subordinate official to set them aside at will. We have a similar situation under the United States Government. The Indians in their reservations are not taxed or requested to contribute towards the expenses of the Government, and no State within whose limits an Indian reservation is located would attempt to tax said Indians. They are, after a century, still favored for reasons which white citizens appreciate. In California the missions were as many reservations on Indian land. Why then do Bancroft, Hittell, and other traducers of the friars applaud in the subordinate Solá a treatment which was entirely in opposition to the laws? Well, the only reason is that the mission Indians were ruled by Catholic friars and not by secular agents. Only those scribes lack the manhood to confess as much frankly.

The situation in California at the end of 1821 was therefore this: The missions were obliged to deliver to the governor one-half of the proceeds of everything they sold to traders, and in return to accept a note upon which they could realize nothing. Of the other half sold to traders the missions were called upon to pay in addition six per cent. to

---

[49] Bancroft, ii, 438.

the governor.[50] Could any commercial concern bear up under such a drain on its resources? Yet, under such circumstances the missionaries were then and ever after accused of accumulating wealth for themselves, and of being so fond of their position as not to be willing to surrender it! The wonder is that the friars contrived to keep any neophytes in the fold at all. The affection of the poor Indians must have been deep, indeed, to make them willing to slave along with their spiritual guides for insatiable and inconsiderate troops. Truly, the last Spanish governor was doing his best to alienate affection for Spanish rule, and he was effectually preparing the inhabitants, not excluding the friars, to submit to any change with the faint hope that the conditions might be more bearable.

[50] "The duties exacted were 25 per cent. on imports; 6 per cent. by seller and 6 per cent. by buyer on exports." Bancroft, ii., 473.

CHAPTER IX.

Zeal of the Fathers.—Expedition of Fathers Payéras and Sánchez. —Expedition of Captain Luis Argüello.—Fr. Ordaz its Chronicler.—The Regency in Mexico.—Council at Monterey.—Oath of Allegiance.—First General Election.—Solá Elected Delegate to Mexico.—Arrival of Comisionado Fernández.—Council at Monterey.—Fernández's Five Propositions.—Fernández and Fr. Payéras Visit the Russian Fort.—Expedition Described.—Election of the First Legislature.—Luis Argüello Elected Temporary Governor.—Fr. Payéras to Emperor Iturbide.—Fernández and Solá Depart.—Iturbide Deposed and Shot.—Bancroft on Solá.

HARASSED as they were and almost disheartened in consequence of the difficulties that beset them, it would seem that the missionaries must have lost all courage to establish new missions. Yet the prospect of having to surrender their present charges only revived their hopes of accomplishing that very object. For want of the necessary royal authority, as well as lack of means, during the last fifteen years they had been chafing to bring the Gospel to the savages on the other side of the sierras and to those north and east of San Francisco Bay. This was the work for which especially Fr. Payéras pined. At last, in September, 1821, while on a visit at Mission San Diego, he determined with the approval of the governor to make the acquaintance of the pagans in the southeast. His object for the present was to ascertain their disposition towards Christianity and to discover sites suitable for missions.

Accompanied by Fr. José B. Sánchez, six guards, and the two retired soldiers, José Manuel Silvas and Marcos Briones, the Fr. Comisario set out from San Diego Mission on September 10th, 1821. After traveling five leagues towards the east he reached Santa Monica or El Cajon, a rancheria of Mission San Diego. From there he went north over a zigzag trail through valleys to the Cañada de Santa Isabel or

Elcuanam, eleven leagues from Santa Monica.[1] Here on September 15th Fr. M. Payéras solemnly planted the cross in the presence of six hundred Indians. Next day, Sunday, he sang High Mass and preached. On September 17th, leaving Fr. Sánchez behind on account of illness, the Fr. Comisario continued northward four leagues and a half to Jacopin or Agua Caliente in what is now called Warner's Ranch. He visited various rancherias and localities[2] and then returned to Santa Isabel. "The 18th," Fr. Sánchez writes, "we passed partly writing and partly giving instruction to a dying aged woman. She passed away the same day at the age of apparently ninety years. In the afternoon thirteen old men and women came to be instructed. The youngest counted sixty years. Fr. Payéras was in his element here. He instructed the candidates with the view of baptizing them the next day, which he did after having once more enlightened them on their obligations. Both Fathers then continued on their journey towards the north and east. Within a distance of six or seven leagues they discovered ten Indian rancherias which contained about four hundred and fifty inhabitants. About two leagues and a half from Santa Isabel, at a spot called Guadalupe, Fr. Payéras raised the cross to mark the site of a proposed mission. All the Indians met on the way expressed a desire to have the Fathers in their country.

On September 20th the little party started out at four o'clock in the morning and reached San Antonio de Pala at about four o'clock in the afternoon. This was a mission station belonging to Mission San Luis Rey. Fr. Sánchez describes the soil, trees, water courses along the road which it would be too tedious to repeat here, but which we intend to dwell upon in the local history. On the feast of St. Matthew, September 21st, the Fr. Comisario held the canoni-

---

[1] The places passed were Cañada del Arrastradero, Michegua, Jueptahua, Pamó, Canapui, and Egepam.

[2] Those named are San Felipe, Cañada de San Dieguito, Guichapa, Geonat, Talayojai, Tamataia or Jamatai, Mucucuiz, Gelonopai, Egenal, Tegilque, Gecuar, Ajata or Las Llagas, San José Valley, and Buena Vista Springs.

cal visitation of the chapel, after which four of the guards returned to the presidio of San Diego. Next day, Saturday, Fr. Payéras sang a High Mass in honor of the Immaculate Queen, and then examined the surroundings to find a place for a new mission. It was thought that Pala could well maintain a large population. After celebrating holy Mass and preaching on Sunday morning, a number of Indians from



Signature of Fr. José Bernardo Sánchez.

San Gabriel and San Juan Capistrano consulted with the Fr. Comisario, who with Fr. Sánchez set out for the north in the afternoon. Soon after leaving Pala, Fr. Sánchez remarks, "we found ourselves in a valley where there was a rock which had served and still served as a stumbling block to the poor natives. A mere glance at the many huge figures and the adjoining thicket let us understand what it might be. The Fr. Comisario ordered Fr. Peiri of San Luis Rey to have it destroyed." At half past five in the afternoon all reached Temécula, three leagues from Pala.

Early next morning the explorers went down the cañada toward the setting of the sun. About a league from the starting point they came to a spring which they named San Isídro, and a little beyond they discovered another spring which they called Santa Gertrudis. Towards evening they reached Jaguara or San Jacinto, a cattle ranch of Mission San Luis Rey. It was about eleven or twelve leagues from Temécula. Here the expedition rested on the 25th on account of rain and the infirmity of Fr. Payéras. Next day the march was resumed. After traveling nine leagues the wanderers came to the mission station of San Bernardino, which the Indians called Guachinga. This was attended from San Gabriel. During the next days they visited the rancherias

in the surrounding country. All the Indians desired a mission in their midst, and promised to become Christians. After holy Mass on the 29th the little party continued their journey to the westward and entered a valley which Fr. Payéras named Jesus Maria. The Fr. Comisario thought it suitable for a mission as all the requisites were abundant. Mission San Gabriel already kept its cattle there. Fr. Payéras celebrated holy Mass and preached here on Sunday, September 30th. Afterwards he instructed and baptized two old men and one aged woman who were at the point of death. Later he instructed a number of pagans in the rudiments of Religion. Next morning at four o'clock the Fr. Comisario and his attendants set out for Mission San Gabriel. Three hours later they reached Jubabal on the banks of the Rio Santa Ana. After stopping for dinner at Guapia they continued, passed Ajuenga, and at eight in the evening arrived at the mission. They had marched twenty-one leagues after leaving San Bernardino.[3] Fr. Payéras's desire to establish one or two missions on sites designated was never realized; but most of the fifteen hundred pagans, whom they had encountered, in course of time joined the missions nearest to their rancherias. The journal of the expedition was kept by Fr. José Sánchez of San Diego.[4]

An expedition of another nature prepared to set out from the presidio of San Francisco soon after. It had been rumored that some English or American immigrants or adventurers had established themselves somewhere within forty or fifty leagues north of the bay. Governor Solá determined to ascertain the truth, and, if necessary, to drive out the intruders. The expedition consisted of Captain Luis Argüello, Sub-lieutenant Francisco de Haro, Alférez José Antonio Sánchez, Cadet Joaquin Estudillo, Don Ramon Navarete, Rafael the Indian interpreter, thirty-five leather-jacket soldiers, and twenty infantrymen. Fr. Blas Ordáz, with the permission of Fr. Payéras, accompanied the troops as chaplain and chronicler. The necessary supplies were

[3] "Habiendo andado como 21 leguas de San Bernardino."

[4] Fr. Sánchez, "Diario de la Caminata." "Sta. Barb. Arch."

furnished by the three northern missions. Missions Santa Clara and San José sent horses and much of the provisions directly to Carquines Strait.

The whole company, joined by some Ululatos and Canucaymos Indians, who wished to visit their pagan relatives, set sail in the two launches of the presidio and the mission about eleven o'clock on the morning of Thursday, October 18th, 1821, and landed near the estéro of San Rafael, at Ruyuta, in the vicinity of what is now Point San Pedro, where they passed the night. Next day they continued the voyage to Carquines Strait where they were joined by two other boats. On Saturday the horses were ferried across the stream. On Sunday, the 21st, Fr. Ordáz celebrated holy Mass, whereupon the troops and Indians passed over to the other side. The march north began on Monday and continued to October 30th up the valley of the Sacramento, which the Spaniards called Jesus Maria. Unfortunately Fr. Blas gives no distances nor latitudes, so that it is impossible to locate the different Indian villages and camping-places. The natives in but a few cases showed hostility, but the booming of the cannon would disperse them. Only in one case Sergeant Amador despite Argüello's orders aimed low and killed seven of the aggressors. The most serious mishap to the soldiers was the loss of a mule that fell into the river with two thousand cartridges on its back. Until the 30th Rafael found little difficulty to converse with the Indians, but from that date the Spaniards had to content themselves with the sign language.

On October 31st the expedition departed from its northward course and turned to the west, according to Fr. Ordáz, until it came to the foot of a mountain range fifteen leagues from the Sierra Nevada, which range extended from north to south and terminated in the region of Bodéga, then in the possession of the Russians. An Indian attack at night was repulsed by the explosion of a grenade. Next day after holy Mass the return march was begun and continued southward over the mountains for nine days. No distances are given, so it is impossible to trace the route; but the ex-

plorers experienced great difficulties. Many horses died, and four pack-mules fell down a precipice. On November 10th they found the body of a neophyte from San Rafael who had been killed by savages. After Christian burial had been accorded, the weary wanderers arrived at a spring which they named San Jorge. Next day, Sunday, Fr. Blas celebrated holy Mass for the last time on the journey, as at about six p. m. they reached Olompali, six leagues from San Rafael. Worn out, and the rations nearly exhausted, the explorers arrived at San Rafael towards noon of the 12th. Here Fr. Blas next morning sang a High Mass in thanksgiving. In the forenoon of the 15th all had again returned to the presidio of San Francisco.[5]

Bancroft thinks that the expedition may have reached the latitude of Shasta, or of Weaverville in Trinity County, and that the Spaniards struggled back through the mountains by way of Ukiah, Cloverdale, Healdsburg, Santa Rosa and Petaluma. He reached this conclusion by allowing ninety-six hours travel for the nine days at the rate of two miles an hour.[6] One pleasant feature of the toilsome journey is worthy of note. Besides attending holy Mass on the days when Fr. Blas celebrated the holy Sacrifice, which was every Sunday and feast day, the members of the expedition appear to have recited the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin with their night prayers in common before retiring for the night.[7] Evidently Captain Luis Argüello and his men were not yet imbued with the irreligious notions of the Mexican military of a later date, who in consequence signalized themselves by their disregard of the moral law.

News in those days traveled slowly, and California was far away from the Mexican capital. That is why in California the establishment of the Iturbide regency[8] was not

---

[5] Fr. Blas Ordáz, "Diario," "Sta. Barb. Arch." Details belong to San Francisco local annals.

[6] Bancroft, ii, 445-449.

[7] "Despues de haber rezado el Santo Rosario," Fr. Blas says at the close of the first day.

[8] See chapter vii.

announced until the end of 1821. The Californians had the year before sworn to the Constitution framed by the Córtes of 1812, and still regarded themselves as subjects of King Fernando VII. Though Mexico had declared itself independent of the mother country, the "Plan de Iguala" provided for an empire governed by Ferdinand VII., or, in case he refused to reside in Mexico, by one of the royal princes. In this sense independence was considered acceptable by the Spaniards who still entertained some affection for Spanish rule, even by Governor Solá. The latter as late as January 10th, 1822, wrote to Governor Argüello of Lower California, that he had received from Mexico "such documents as are printed in a country of dreamers, since independence is a dream. Day by day their presses will turn out absurdities by the thousand; but you and I, aware that the immortal, incomparable Spanish nation has many and great resources with which to make herself respected, must look with contempt on such absurd views."[9]

When, therefore, in March, 1822, despatches announcing the regency arrived at Monterey, Solá on the 16th requested all the military commanders, as well as Fr. Prefecto Payéras and Fr. Presidente Señan, to attend a council at Monterey. The sessions opened on April 9th in the territorial hall. Those participating were Governor Solá, Fr. Mariano Payéras, Fr. Vicente de Sarriá, who represented Fr. José Señan, Luis Antonio Argüello of the San Francisco presidio, José de la Guerra of Santa Barbara garrison, José Maria Estudillo, who represented Comandante Francisco Maria Ruiz of San Diego,[10] Pablo de la Portilla, commander of the troops from Mazatlán, José Antonio Navarete, commander of the troops from Tepíc, and Lieutenants José Maria Estrada and Manuel Gómez of Monterey. All these members of the council resolved to take the oath of independence and to swear allegiance to the Supreme Government. The ceremonies took place in the meeting hall on April 11th; the troops took the oath in the public plaza. Religious services

[9] Bancroft, ii, 450.

[10] Captain Ruiz and Fr. Señan were absent on account of illness.

followed, during which Fr. Prefecto Payéras delivered an appropriate address. The solemnities were accompanied by universal rejoicing, the firing of cannon and muskets, and closed with an illumination.[11] Amid similar ceremonies the oath was also taken at Santa Barbara on April 13th, at San Francisco about the same time, and at San Diego on the 20th. The instructions directing the missionaries to take the oath with their Indians were also observed at all the missions. The only Father who, down to July, seems to have



Signature of Fr. Jayme Escudé.

refused to swear, was Fr. Jayme Escudé, and he declined in the hope of receiving permission to retire; but he finally took the oath in the said month. Fr. Peiri, too, declared he would refuse if he could return to Spain. Later on he became enthusiastic, and we shall find him overdoing it somewhat.[12]

The Bishop of Sonora notified Fr. Señan that the Secretary of State on October 7th, 1821, had ordered that on three days public petitions should be made to the Most High for the welfare of the National Government; and that by order of the Imperial Council the Secretary of State also requested that in gratitude to those fallen in the Revolution for Independence a Solemn Anniversary Requiem should be celebrated in all parish and mission churches for the souls of the victims.[13]

---

[11] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 1-3; Dept. St. Pap. i, 7-11; St. Pap. xvii, 267; 576; Hittell, ii, 43-44; Bancroft, ii, 450-451.

[12] Fr. Payéras, "Informe," April 21st; Fr. Señan, "Circular," November 2nd, 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch." "Cal. Arch." Dept. St. Pap. i, 6; Bancroft, ii, 452-453.

[13] Bishop to Fr. Señan, December 7th, 1821. Libro de Ordenes.

Under the provisional regulations of the Mexican Regency California was entitled to be represented by a delegate at the forthcoming Congress. At the meeting on April 12th it was then decided by the aforesaid council to choose four electors to represent the four presidial jurisdictions and one for Los Angeles. The delegate to be elected by these five representatives should receive $4000 to be raised by voluntary subscriptions or by a tax.[14] The choice of the Indians of Mission Santa Barbara was the neophyte Julian Tagatset, who was elected on April 22nd.[15] There is no record extant of any other local election, nor of the men chosen to represent the respective missions or towns in the conventions that selected the representatives, but no military men could be electors. The five electors selected were Francisco Castro for the towns of Branciforte and San José, and the missions of San Francisco, Santa Clara, San José, and Santa Cruz; José Aruz for Monterey and the missions of San Carlos, San Juan Bautista, Soledad, San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo; Francisco Ortéga for the presidio of Santa Barbara, and the missions of Santa Barbara, San Buenaventura, Purisima, Santa Inés, and San Fernando; José Palomáres for Los Angeles; and Ignacio López for the presidio of San Diego, and the missions of San Diego, San Luis Rey, San Juan Capistrano, and San Gabriel. The five representatives met at Monterey on May 21st and chose Governor Solá as delegate to the Mexican Congress. This offered him the long-desired opportunity to retire from California for which he had repeatedly petitioned the former viceroy. Captain Luis Argüello was elected as substitute.[16]

On April 13th Solá issued an appeal for the payment of the $4000 allowed him.[17] Fr. Mariano Payéras in a circular

---

[14] Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Señan, April 14th, 1822. Bancroft, ii, 453-454.

[15] This was the first general election in which the Indians had a nominal voice.

[16] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 3-7.

[17] He wanted "un donativo gracioso." Solá to Fr. Payéras, April 13th, 1822. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Sacramento, xviii, 19.

of the 17th accompanying the appeal urged the Fathers to donate outright what it was possible to spare. Eleven missions at once donated $1560, and seven for lack of money offered drafts of $100 each on the síndico at Tepíc or the procurator at the capital. Mission San Francisco was the only one unable, it seems, to furnish anything in the way of money.[18]

Though everything worked smoothly enough, the officers, soldiers, missionaries, neophytes, and colonists had formally renounced their allegiance to Spain, and had become faithful subjects of the new Mexican empire, California was much distrusted in Mexico, where the manifestations of patriotism, owing to the great distance, had not as yet been published. The Regency therefore thought it advisable to send an agent in order to ascertain the sentiments of the Californians, to foment a spirit of independence, to obtain an oath of allegiance, to raise the new national flag, and to put in working order the new constitutional government. The Rev. Agustin Fernández de San Vicente, a canon of the cathedral of Durango, was selected for this position and sent first to Lower California.[19] After he had accomplished his purpose in the peninsula, the Rev. Commissioner sailed for Monterey, and arrived there in the *San Carlos* accompanied by another priest on September 26th.

Some time before, the Fathers had received a circular from Fr. Guardian José Gasól. It expressed the hope that all the friars had taken the oath of allegiance as all had done at the College on October 31st, 1821, because rumors to the contrary were spread at the capital which had caused him to be summoned before the Regency to explain; that he had declared his belief that the missionaries had taken the oath of independence; that if there had been reluctance

---

[18] Fr. Payéras in the circular assigned the amount each mission was to contribute. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1369. Also Fr. Payéras to the Diputacion, November 16th, 1822. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1379.

[19] Fr. Gasól to Fr. Payéras, April 18th; Solá to Fr. Payéras, July 15th; J. B. Martiarena to the Fathers, Tepíc, June 4th; Rev. Fernández to Fr. Payéras, September 26th, 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch." See vol. i, 579-583.

heretofore he expected all to submit for the peace and tranquillity of the country; and that they would receive the Rev. Commissioner Fernández with due respect, act in accord with him, furnish him with everything needed, and in this way refute the charges circulated in Mexico.[20]

Canon Fernández began his activity by demanding a full report on the location, population, land, product, and livestock of each mission. In addition he wanted to know about the gold and silver mines and the pearl fisheries, and the means to make them payable. The last question called for information on the places most exposed to Indian assaults, and the number of soldiers that defended them.[21]

Fr. Payéras on October 5th promptly sent a copy of the demands to the missions with the request to comply after a formula which he inclosed. Of interest here are only questions five and six, as the others will be utilized in the local history. In his reply the Fr. Commissary declared on behalf of his own mission, which was typical of the others, that no gold or silver mines had been discovered, though some one whose heart was set upon them had dreamed that there were traces to be seen on a cliff along the coast about five leagues from Purisima. Nor were there any pearl-fisheries in Upper California.[22]

The comisionado next turned his attention to the civil government of the territory. At a meeting on October 8th in which eight officials and three Fathers [23] participated along with Rev. Fernández, and at which Governor Solá presided, as Fr. Payéras reports, five subjects were broached by the

---

[20] Fr. Gasól to Fr. Payéras, April 18th, 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[21] Rev. Fernández to Fr. Payéras, October 1st, 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[22] Fr. Payéras, "Circular y Informe," October 5th, 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[23] Those present besides Solá and Fernández were Fathers Payéras, Sarriá, and Tapis, Luis Argüello, Navarete, Estudillo, Estrada, Gómez and Haro. Solá to J. de la Guerra, October 9th, 1822. "Cal. Arch.," Prov. Rec. xi, 316-319. Fr. Payéras gives no names.

commissioner. He also decided them, whilst the others enjoyed the privilege of consenting.[24] By way of introduction it was insisted, 1. that the "Plan de Iguala" was now in force, and that the Indians were free; but in view of their inaptitude to live unaided, they should remain under tutelage. If, however, any one of the neophytes be found capable of car-



Signature of Rev. Agustín Fernández de San Vicente.

ing for himself he should, with the approval of the comandante of the district and the consent of the missionary, be free to join a pueblo or live alone with his family, and should receive the property coming to him. It will be seen that the Rev. Ag. Fernández acted not nearly as overbearing here as in Lower California. He practically left things at the missions as they existed before his arrival.

2. A diputacion or legislature should be organized at Monterey, the capital, and should be composed of the governor and four individuals besides a secretary. The pueblos of Los Angeles and San José should have their ayuntamientos or town councils.

3. The Mexican Government has abolished the lash as a means of punishment; but in order to keep the Indians in subjection the whip might be used and applied over the clothes. Blocks, stocks, fetters, and shackles, as well as imprisonment might also be a means of punishment or correction.

4. "The comisionado then declared it the express will of the government that public instruction should be fostered in every way possible, because, he argued, without letters there

[24] "The topics were decided—by the canónigo." Bancroft, ii, 461.

is no enlightenment, and without this there are no virtues."[25] "Nothing was left undone," Fr. Com. Payéras reporting this meeting says, "to make it clear to him how many obstacles we have encountered thus far in order to establish schools among us for the purpose of teaching to read and to write; but that would not satisfy him. Hence, until the Imperial Government shall send us the teachers promised by His Honor, he admonished us, in order to comply as much as possible, to at least appoint one of the most suitable Indians to teach those who are capable to learn reading and writing."

5. Finally (in case of an invasion) it was unanimously resolved, that the neophytes might be armed with bows and arrows, lassoes and lances, but not with fire-arms.[26]

The imperial commissioner, Rev. Agustin Fernández de San Vicente, now determined to visit the Russian settlement at Fort Ross, which the Spaniards from its founder called Coscoff, for the purpose of gathering as much information as possible for his government. Fr. Commissary Prefect Mariano Payéras, who consented to accompany him, kept a journal of the expedition from which we extract the most interesting points. Leaving Monterey on October 11th, the two dignitaries with their attendants went by way of the Rancho del Rey,[27] through the Cañada de Natividad northeast to Mission San Juan Bautista where they passed Sunday October 13th. Next day they arrived at Mission Santa Clara, and in the evening of the 15th they reached Mission San Francisco by way of San Francisquito, Rancho

---

[25] "Porque, siguió, sin letras no hay ilustracion, y sin esta no hay virtudes." That was asserting too much. There have been millions of good Christians, hence virtuous, without knowing letters; and there are many more millions filled with that secular knowledge who are not virtuous at all.

[26] Fr. Payéras, "Circular," October 9th, 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch." In a letter to Solá Fr. Payéras, May 2nd, 1820, said it was hazardous to arm Indians, especially those from the sierras. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1086; 1257.

[27] Rancho Nacional, or San Pedro, now Salinas.

de las Pulgas, San Mateo, and El Portezuelo. "On the 19th," Fr. Payéras writes, "we set out at seven in the morning for the presidio, which is one good league distant. There Captain Luis Argüello and Lieutenant Antonio del Valle with some troops and servants joined us. At ten o'clock we embarked in the launch, but for want of wind we had to row. We reached the Estéro of San Rafael, seven leagues distant, at three in the afternoon. Fr. Juan Amorós, the missionary, with the sergeant and the neophytes, received us amid the ringing of bells and extraordinary rejoicing." The horses had been sent hither before.

On Sunday October 20th, Fr. Payéras celebrated holy Mass in honor of the angelic patron San Rafael for the success of the journey. Then "in the name of God" they went five leagues north to the place called Santa Lucía de Olompali, thence northwestwardly two leagues to Arroyo San Antonio. Leaving the arroyo to the left, they travelled laboriously over hills without water or wood and through a cañada for six leagues, until they arrived at two springs which were named San Vicente, probably in honor of the comisionado. Next day the little party continued toward the northwest over steep hills, rounded the Estéro del Americano, and at noon descried the port of Bodéga to the south. Descending they stood at the bayshore eleven leagues from San Vicente. Four leagues more of painful travel towards the northwest brought them to Salmon Creek, which the comisionado for reasons of his own named Arroyo Verde. Two leagues farther on the travellers reached the Russian River, which Captain Argüello the year previous had seen about thirteen leagues higher up, and had christened San Ignacio. One and a half leagues beyond, they passed Arroyo Santa Maria, and four leagues more of hard riding brought the imperial comisionado and his following to the Russian fort. The commander, Captain Carlos Schmidt, received him cordially with a salute of four guns, and treated all with the kindest hospitality. The Spaniards remained there two days. Fr. Payéras drew up a very long

description of the fort and vicinity which it would be tedious to reproduce here. On October 24th the two Fathers with a few attendants were rowed down to Bodéga Bay, ten leagues south, by fifteen oarsmen. After a lunch there the comisionado and companions crossed over to the other side and camped at the point. Next day they made their way over the hills, came back to the so-called Estéro del Americano, thence went for a league and a half over hills to another estéro which received the name Herrera, because Sergeant Herrera had the misfortune to fall into it without more harm to himself, however. "We passed it," says Fr. Payéras, "and after two leagues of travel we came to a grand estéro eleven leagues long and six hundred yards wide, which the Indians called Tamáles, but which the Spaniards named San Juan Francisco Regis. On the left bank were two springs."

Leaving the estéro to the right, they went southeast three leagues to the two springs of Fr. J. Amorós where they took dinner. Continuing in the same direction they reached the Arroyo of San Antonio, where they had been on the 20th, and after having travelled six leagues they pitched camp once more on its left bank. October 26th saw them leave the arroyo to the left. They traversed the Sierra de Santa Lucía, passed through the Valley of Lobato, and after eight leagues of wandering returned to San Rafael. On Monday 28th, after holy Mass, both priests with their attendants embarked half a league from San Rafael, crossed San Pedro and San Pablo Points, and after coursing over the water towards the southeast for five leagues disembarked in the Estéro of San Pablo to camp for the night. Next day partly on horseback and partly in a carriage, passing the Ranchos of San Leandro and San Lorenzo, they made the eleven leagues to Mission San José. On October 31st, after holy Mass, accompanied by Fr. Duran of San José and Fr. Viader of Santa Clara, the party proceeded in a carreta or carriage to Mission Santa Clara, five leagues to the west. All Saints Day was celebrated with splendor at Mission Santa Clara,

and next day the comisionado with Fr. Payéras set out for Mission San Juan Bautista, where they finished the journey shortly after noon.[28]

Under the regulations of the Mexican Regency, and in accordance with Fernández's demand, the same electors who on May 21st had chosen Solá delegate to the Mexican Congress, reassembled at Monterey on November 9th for the purpose of electing the members who were to constitute the first legislative assembly. The comisionado intimated that they might re-elect themselves if they wished. The voting accordingly resulted in the choice of José Aruz, Francisco Ortéga, Francisco Cástro, and José Palomáres. Carlos Cástro was substituted for Ignacio López, and José Antonio Carrillo was added to make up the required six representatives. The governor presided at the deliberations in virtue of his office. Francisco de Haro was appointed secretary. These men composed the first legislature of Upper California. Antonio Cástro and José Cástro were chosen substitutes. Before the members were installed a solemn High Mass was celebrated. Fr. Comisario-Prefecto Mariano Payéras delivered the sermon as on a previous occasion. Then followed the Te Deum and the salutes of the artillery and infantry.[29]

The first duty of the diputacion or legislature was the election of a political chief[30] or temporary governor to succeed Solá. José de la Guerra appears to have been the choice of the old settlers. He also was the senior officer in the territory, and would have succeeded in the ordinary course of proceedings; but as he was a Spaniard, Comisionado Fernández insisted that a governor must be chosen by the deputation. When the diputádos assembled on November

---

[28] Fr. Payéras, Diario. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[29] "Cal. Arch.," Prov. Rec. xi, 316-319; Leg. Rec. i, 5-8.

[30] "Jefe Politico" was the new name adopted in Mexico. We retain the old title to avoid confusion.

11th, 1822,[31] he contrived to have the majority cast their votes for Captain Luis Argüello, comandante as well as native of San Francisco presidio, who thereupon was introduced into the office and took up his headquarters at Monterey.[32]

Though all the friars had already sworn allegiance to Mexican independence and the constituted authorities, Canon Fernández persuaded Fr. Payéras to have them express their loyalty in writing. Owing to the great distances of some of the missions, the replies of all the Fathers had not arrived by November 13th. Fr. Payéras, therefore, on the next day, in the name of all the missionaries and their neophytes, addressed a long letter to Emperor Iturbide assuring him of their loyalty and of their prayers for himself and his family. He hoped that, though all the Indians along the coast now adored God in spirit and truth, His Majesty would not forget that there were still many pagans to be converted in the north and east.[33]

The Rev. Fernández had now accomplished his task; he therefore prepared to depart in company of the ex-governor. During the month of October the Fr. Comisario-Prefecto once more assessed the missions in favor of Solá to the amount of $3000. Of this the ex-governor on November 27th received from Fr. Payéras a draft for $1500 on Síndico Juan Martiarena at Tepíc. The remainder was probably paid in cash. The three poorest missions, San Francisco, San Antonio, and Soledad, were each directed to contribute $100. The others found $150 or $200 opposite their names on the list forwarded to them.[34] Solá and Fernández sailed from Monterey in the *San Carlos* on November 22nd.

---

[31] This is the date Fr. Payéras gives in a letter to Solá, November 15th. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1378. Bancroft, ii, 467, has "November 9 or 10."

[32] Fr. Payéras to Solá, November 15th, 1822. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1378.

[33] Fr. Payéras to Iturbide, November 14th, 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[34] Fr. Payéras, "Lista de Donativo," October 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Fr. Payéras to the Diputacion, November 16th, 1822; to

When Canon Fernández, who had tarried in Upper California just two months, returned to Mexico, he learned that great changes had taken place in the government. Iturbide on May 19th, 1822, had been elected and on July 21st crowned Emperor of Mexico; but on March 19th, 1823, he was compelled to abdicate. In April the Mexican Congress vested the executive power in these three generals: Nicolás Bravo, Guadalupe Victoria, and Pedro Celestino Negrete. Iturbide was ordered to leave the country. He returnd secretly, but was captured and sentenced to be shot on July 19th, 1824, five days after landing.[35]

Of Solá we know nothing more than that he was a member with nine others of a Board or "Junta de Fomento de Californias." This body was to aid the Mexican President concerning California affairs; but it was dissolved in 1827.[36] According to Bancroft, "Solá's inclinations were to be a gentleman, wise, public-spirited, liberal, brave, dignified, but affable. Under favorable circumstances he might have made those qualities the prominent characteristics of his rule; but the first wave of adversity swept them away leaving a peevish, despotic, egotistic, and ill-tempered old man. He was fond of children and paid much attention to the schoolboys in Monterey. He was, moreover, kindhearted and honorable." [37] Canon Fernández became vicar of the Bishop of Durango and as such lived at Santa Fe, New Mexico, from 1825-1826.[38]

Martiarena, November 24th, 1822; to the Diputacion, December 9th, 1822. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1379; 1386.

[35] Alaman, "Historia de Mejico," tom. v, lib. ii, capp. v, vii, viii, ix, x; Bancroft, "Mexico," iv, capp. xxxi-xxxiii.

[36] Bancroft, iii, p. 3.

[37] Bancroft, ii, 472-473.

[38] He was a worldling, and not averse to gambling, the ruling passion of the Mexicans and Californians of that period; but the charge of immorality comes with a poor grace from the Vallejos and Alvarados. It is too much even for Bancroft. Nor did Hittell discover any evidence in the archives, otherwise he would not have failed to avail himself of the opportunity for a tirade against priests and religious. Bancroft, iii, 737.

CHAPTER X.

Forfeiture of a Privilege.—Decision of the Bishops of Mexico.—Discouraging Letter of the Fr. Guardian.—The Missions Contribute as Before.—Fr. Payéras Counsels Submission.—More Contributions Demanded.—Indolent Troops.—Disgust of the Fathers.—First Legislature Imposes Taxes.—Prohibited Books.—Argüello's Proclamation.—Books Destroyed.—Reasons Therefor.—Death of Fr. Payéras.—Bancroft's Lavish Praise.—Death of Fr. Señan.—Bancroft's View.—Fr. Señan to Have Been Historian.

ONE result of withdrawing from subjection to the King of Spain was immediately felt in both Mexico and California. This was the forfeiture of the privileges which the Popes had granted to the Spanish monarchs through the *Bula Cruzada*.[1] Among these was the permission to eat fleshmeat on days prohibited, in consideration of a small annual contribution for a certificate called "Bula," and which entitled the holder to use such privilege. The money was collected and the "Bulas" delivered to the donors by government officials. The amount thus collected was turned over to the government. Fr. Sarriá at Monterey called the attention of the soldiers to this feature of independence, as the other Fathers probably did elsewhere.[2] To quiet the consciences of the people in Mexico, and at the request of

---

[1] See Appendix D.

[2] Fr. Ramón Abella to Fr. M. Payéras, May 23rd, 1822. "Sta. Barb. Arch." "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Sacramento, xviii, 22. Bancroft, ii, 453, on the authority of Vallejo says that Solá, in consequence, excused the soldiers from religious service! That shows how little Vallejo had studied his religious catechism. What Solá answered Fr. Abella, according to above letter, was, "Ellos (Soldados) son Cristianos; han de oir Misa." "The soldiers are Christians; they must hear Mass." The reader will please bear in mind that Mariano Vallejo was the Muenchhausen of early California, with this difference that Muenchhausen lied for diversion and harmed no one, Vallejo lied through malice.

some of the bishops, the Archbishop of Mexico on November 28th, 1821, issued an edict on the subject of the forfeited privileges. With regard to the use of fleshmeat, eggs, etc., on the days of fasting and abstinence, he declared, that, inasmuch as it was not easy to obtain a concession from the Holy See for the present year, he would himself in virtue of his authority grant the dispensation for his archdiocese, so that all the faithful, except those who were bound to abstain on account of their vows or rules, might use the said food on such days just the same as though they possessed the privilege of the Bula Cruzada.[3] The Bishop of Sonora adopted and extended the Archbishop's decision to the faithful of his own diocese on January 16th, 1822.[4] On November 27th, 1822, the Archbishop renewed the dispensation for one year in his jurisdiction, the Bishop of Sonora approved the grant for his diocesans, and Fr. Presidente José Señan published the concession in a circular to the Fathers on June 1st, 1823. October 9th, 1823, the bishop continued the same dispensations for the years 1824 and 1825.[5]

Later, February 23rd, 1829, Fr. Presidente José Sánchez, inquired of the Bishop of Sonora concerning the obligation to abstain and fast. He received the following reply: "In the year 1821 an Ecclesiastical Conference was held in Mexico composed of the Archbishop and other Prelates, in order to discuss and agree upon the question whether the privileges of the Bula Cruzada as well as other Apostolic concessions continued. At the said Conference it was decided affirmatively, as well for military persons as for those who are not such, that they could continue to eat meat on days prohibited, and not excepted by the Bull of the Indult. Álamos, May 23rd, 1829." This decision reached Fr. Presi-

[3] Libro de Ordenes. Fr. Garijo to Fr. Payéras, January 1st, 1823. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[4] Libro de Ordenes.

[5] Libro de Ordenes

dente Sánchez on September 11th, 1829.[6] The practice was observed in California while Mexican rule lasted.

Meanwhile both Fr. Comisario Prefecto Payéras and Fr. Presidente Señan were afflicted with diseases which soon carried them away. Fr. Señan had been ailing for years, but continued in charge of San Buenaventura. There was no help for it, because the College could send no relief. We shall understand the situation better through an extract of a letter addressed to Fr. Señan by Fr. Payéras on June 29th, 1822, quoted on pages 89-91, chapter v. Even Ex-Governor Solá promised "to represent to the Supreme Government the extreme need of more priests, as most of those in the territory were exhausted either from infirmity or old age, so that they could not fulfill their duties; nor could the few young Fathers attend to so many missions."[7] The prospects of receiving aid from the College, however, were not encouraging. A letter from Fr. Pr. Agustín Garijo, who after the death of Fr. Guardian José Gasól filled out the unex-



Signature of Fr. Agustín Garijo.

pired term under the title of presidente-in-cápite, only deepened the gloom. "I can do nothing more," he writes to Fr. Payéras,[8] "than repeat what the late Fr. Guardian has at various times said in reply to your petitions, because we find ourselves in the same and even in a worse predicament. The College has not enough friars to perform the ordinary duties. Several are unfit for service by reason of advanced

[6] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[7] Solá to Fr. Escudé, September 10th, 1822. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Sacramento, xviii, 52.

[8] Fr. Garijo to Fr. Payéras, January 1st, 1823. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

age or infirmities, yet they find themselves under the necessity of having to toil as though they were youths in order to sustain our good name. Nevertheless, their efforts fail to silence the cutting and dissolute tongues which unfortunately abound in public and private, and whose venom appears also in public print. Only God knows the anguish and bitterness that weighs down our spirit. Your Reverence must not think that I exaggerate; on the contrary, the reality is far worse than I can say. The worst of it is that we can discover no nook in whole Christendom where we could breathe freely, otherwise you may take it for granted that no one would stay at the College, even though it were necessary to cross the seas. We are all convinced that the least oppressed are those who reside in Upper California. The Church of God is facing the most furious storms more or less everywhere according to the greater or smaller number of infidel philosophers and Liberals, and the more or less numerous sins which Almighty God is punishing. . . .

"I am anxiously awaiting the arrival of Vicente de Solá; perhaps he can obtain some help from Congress, which has thus far not taken up the subject of missions. As to those who wish to retire, they are very much deceived if they expect to improve their lot at the College. In my opinion the College will soon come to an end, because it can hope for no recruits from Spain. If God send no remedy the same fate will befall the missions. Here we have no choice but to suffer and await God's good pleasure with resignation. If those Fathers do not feel inclined to make the sacrifices we all are making for the love of God, by remaining at their post, as I beseech you for the sake of Christ, and for the sake of the tender Christianity of the Indians, Your Reverence may grant permission to retire as shall seem best to you before God; but let them understand that they will not find tranquillity either at the College or anywhere else.

"The Government has asked me for a minute report with regard to the number of religious in the missions and the funds with which they maintain themselves. I have replied

to the emperor that the funds and capital consist of annual stipends and of drafts for produce furnished the soldiers in California, but that the former have not been paid since the year 1811, and the latter since 1810. I have reported all that is to be said about the missions. Until now, after two months, nothing has come of it. I was also asked about the state of the College. Besides giving the number and condition and occupation of the friars, I explained that we have no other funds than those of Divine Providence for our subsistence; and that, owing to circumstances which are manifest to every one, the alms have decreased considerably, so that we have come to such a pass that we must look for loans in order to procure food. This is true, my dear Fr. Prefecto. Notwithstanding the strictest economy, the College is mortgaged to such a degree that it may not be paid, because the debt is increasing from day to day. For this reason I was impelled to ask our Brethren in California to help us to food by accepting some 'intentions' for holy Masses; but knowing that by reason of unpaid drafts and stipends you are yourselves distressed I refrained from soliciting the favor. So, because of the scarcity of men and means, and between eating little and toiling much, you can guess what may happen to the College."

The change of governors in California brought no relief for the missions from forced contributions to the military. "The duty of the padres [9] to make up the deficiencies in provincial revenues," says Bancroft,[10] "had come to be regarded largely as a matter of course." However, Argüello's demands were not clothed in the overbearing and sometimes offensive terms which Solá had employed. The missions were still compelled to accept worthless drafts for all sup-

[9] Bancroft and Hittéll persistently use the terms padres, friars and missionaries in this connection instead of stating that the Indians were the real sufferers, because the real owners. But that would not fit in the plan of those historians which is to make it appear that the friars were landlords who managed for their own aggrandizement.

[10] California, ii, 487; 479.

plies, and in addition to pay six or twelve per cent. duty as a "loan" which smothered many trading plans and caused much other distress. We may infer the situation in all the missions at one time or other from a letter which Fr. Duran of Mission San José addressed to Captain Luis Argüello, then of San Francisco.[11] "My heart breaks amid so many afflictions, and more so because of those that are expected. I do not know what we shall have to do, since this year through lack of water scarcely any corn and beans will be grown. Everything is dried up and ruined. Thus it is that the Indians worry me with their hunger, as a great portion of the wheat in the field is spoiled, so that it has become necessary to cut down the rations. I offer to do all I can under such lamentable circumstances; then, as for what I cannot furnish, there is no other recourse than patience. The women will have to stretch their arms on the grinding-stone, as we cannot depend upon the mill; for water is so scarce that it does not suffice for the mission, and because there is no corn and there are no beans, all the wheat will have to be delivered to the presidio for food, notwithstanding that the Indians are suffering from hunger.[12]

"I have said that I expect nothing from the allowances and drafts, because I know not what manner of entanglements, disunions, discords, and jealousies exist in Mexico, which, if they do not cease, must hinder the consolidation of the new government. I fear much that our independence is not of good faith, but that it may be a machination of the

---

[11] Fr. Duran to Argüello, June 13th, 1822. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1406; 1416. "Me quiebra el corazon con tantas miserias, y mas con la perspectiva de las que se esperan."

[12] "Que las mujeras estiren sus brazos para el metate, y no confien en el molino de agua, porque ésta está tan escasa que no alcanza para la mision; y entregará por no haber maiz ni frijol, todo el trigo que necesite el presidio para comer, sin embargo de que los Indios padecen hambre." There was a drouth all over California early in 1822, so that Solá on February 20th asked the presidio commanders to have a Novena held in honor of St. Anthony of Padua for relief. Bancroft, ii, 481.

Illuminati in accord with foreigners, whose purpose is disorganization and anarchy in these beautiful countries which probably are also in the scheme of the *Sect.* Time will tell." [13]

Although the Fathers made light of their own discomforts, they keenly felt the helplessness of their neophytes, who had to slave for the indolent troopers whilst these played the lords of the land. Might was right with the Californians and Mexicans, as well as with the Spaniards before them. To save the main property, at least, for their Indians, Fr. Payéras counseled submission to the inevitable. "I believe," he writes in a circular calling for corn and *mantéca* for the Monterey presidio, "that we should sacrifice the less in order to save the greater. If on account of the small harvest we refuse to give, they will impose on us tithes of all, and the troops will obtain in abundance what they now ask with some moderation." [14]

A month later Fr. Payéras wrote to the Fathers, "At the request of Governor Luis de Argüello I forward to Your Reverences the clamorous demands of the well-deserving troops." As usual the Fathers merely sign their names to the circular when it arrives at their missions, but Fr. Durán volunteered the remark, "if all that is demanded must be furnished, the Indians will have to go hungry." [15]

Here is a sample order for supplies from Comandante José de la Guerra of Santa Barbara, which the five missions of his jurisdiction were expected to provide: 1100 fanégas of corn;

---

[13] Fr. Durán really outlined the conditions of Spain and Mexico for more than half a century after, and in California down to the arrival of the Americans. The "Sect" is still in control of Mexico, France and Portugal, and striving hard for the mastery in Italy and Spain, never for the benefit of the masses, but as in Portugal, to vent its atheism and its hatred for the Church.

[14] Fr. Payéras, "Circular," December 4th, 1822. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1382. Argüello to Fr. Payéras, December 10th, 1822. "Archb. Arch.;" no. 1383.

[15] Fr. Payéras, "Circular," January 4th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1416.

207 fs. of beans; 700 cuñetes de mantéca; 1300 p. of soap; 220 pairs of shoes; 100 blankets; 20 knapsacks; 20 side arms; 10 shields; five leather jackets; 60 pairs of gaiters; 80 yards of serge, etc.[16] It will be observed that in this and similar orders the military demanded many things which the missions could not produce, such as iron and articles made of iron or steel. The missions had to purchase these from trading vessels at a high price, plus twelve per cent. duty, and then deliver them to the garrisons or to the governor; in return they received unredeemable drafts. The Indian establishments would have prospered to a wonderful degree in temporal matters, and the Fathers could have found leisure to devote themselves more to the Christian education of their wards, had they received payment for what they furnished to the presidios. As it was, the chief anxiety of the missionaries was how to keep the Indians quiet at their toil in order to satisfy the soldiery and make ends meet at the missions.

The troops might have helped themselves to a great extent, at least, and thus eased the burden of the Fathers. They possessed cattle and might have had some land, and actually some occupied tracts of land sufficient for gardening. Yet the new governor, Luis de Argüello, on February 13th, 1823, writes to Fr. Payéras, "Since I have arrived here at this presidio of Monterey in January, there have been nothing but lamentations on account of the great scarcity of soap from which every individual of this company is suffering, for the lowest figure at which the habilitado could furnish that material to them was at two *reáles*, and the cheapest kind at one *real*. A small matter, indeed, but necessary for the cleanliness of their numerous families."[17]

A month after this plaint, and at the request of Argüello, Fr. Payéras sent a list of goods and other articles which each mission, save that of San Carlos, donated outright. The

---

[16] José de la Guerra to Fr. Payéras, January 17th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1423.

[17] Argüello to Fr. Payéras. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1428.

goods included clothing, shoes, hats, blankets, stockings, grain, peas, beans, soap, and mules with their saddles and bridles. San Fernando instead donated $200. Purisima, Fr. Payéras's own mission, gave $500.[18]

The Fathers, of course, had to be on the lookout for good bargains with trading ships so as to dispose of some of the mission produce and receive needed articles and cash in return. Iron was one of the articles desired most, but it could be procured only at a large discount. Both the governor and the Fr. Prefect, says Bancroft, entered with some enthusiasm into the plans of some English traders from Lima, and in July 1822 an advantageous contract was concluded for three years from January 1st, 1823. A scale of prices was arranged with Fr. Payéras after consulting with the other friars. The Fr. Prefecto closely attended to the interests of the missions because, as he said, "the times have changed, and the day has long passed when hides and tallow could be had for nothing." By the terms of the contract the company, represented by Hugh McCulloch and William E. P. Hartnell, were bound to send at least one vessel each year to touch at each harbor and roadstead, to take all the hides offered and at least 25,000 arrobas or 312 tons of tallow, and to pay either in money or in such goods as might be desired. Whilst McCulloch returned to Lima, Hartnell remained to manage the business. He later became a Catholic and a prominent resident of the province.[19]

From Fr. Sánchez's letter mentioned on pp. 104-105 we can infer how the missionaries must have loathed a life which compelled them to assume the roles of farmers, clerks, storekeepers, and mechanics. It was bad enough to have to do

---

[18] Fr. Payéras to Argüello, March 13th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1436.

[19] The tariff prices were: Hides, $1 each, large or small; wheat, $3 per fanega; tallow, $2 an arroba; suet, $3; manteca, $4; soap, $16 per cental; beef in pickle, including bone, $4 per cental. Other articles for which no price is noted were horns, hemp, wine, brandy, saffron for dyeing skins, etc. Bancroft, ii, 475-476; Hittell, ii, 72.

this for the sake of their neophytes, but now to be engrossed in such worldly affairs merely for the sake of gratifying the indolent and unappreciative troops was worse. How they must have longed to rid themselves of the burden which robbed them of their spiritual consolations, rendered immeasurably more difficult the religious progress of the neophytes, and made impossible the conversion of the numerous gentiles calling for priests on the other side of the sierras! However, there was no escape from the uncongenial task. No substitutes could be expected. The Fathers felt there would be no relief until the Divine Master Himself should call them, and this was the happy lot of the two most prominent friars, as we shall see presently.

We have still to note that the first territorial legislature assembled on April 12th, 1823, for the purpose of devising ways and means to carry on the provincial government. In order to raise the necessary funds, it was resolved to levy a tax of six per cent. on all exports by the missions or private persons, except brandy, which was taxed ten dollars a barrel anywhere in California.[20] Moreover, for every head of cattle or sheep slaughtered, one *real* or twelve and one-half cents was to be paid into the territorial treasury.[21] The bulk of the revenue, as heretofore, naturally came from the missions, whose managers were glad enough if no heavier burdens were laid on their Indian wards. However, with this the gentlemen were not satisfied.

The enemies of law and order, and all those hostile to the Christian Religion above all, after the manner of their French prototypes, were already making extraordinary efforts to spread their revolutionary notions by means of the press. The Spanish Inquisition had heretofore watched that no books against Religion, Christian morals, and the State circulated among the subjects of the Spanish sovereign. With

---

[20] There was no brandy manufactured at the missions before the time of Mexican independence as far as we know.

[21] Acta de la Diputacion, April 12th, 1823. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Bancroft, ii, 494-495.

the declaration of Mexican independence this institution was abolished, and in consequence the floodgates of immoral and anti-Christian press productions stood wide open. The damage became soon apparent; but the rulers in neither Mexico nor California had as yet become so de-Christianized as not to care whether Religion and virtue thrived or suffered. Emperor Iturbide, accordingly, on September 17th, 1822, directed the bishops to have the following books prohibited and confiscated wherever found: The War of the Gods; The Origin of all Worship; The Ruins of Palmira; El Citador; Sane Reason; El Compadre Mateo; Familiar Letters; Letter to the Pope, and The System of Nature. Fr. Presidente Señan, as vicario foraneo, published the order of the Bishop of Sonora in California during the month of May, 1823.[22]

In the following year Governor Argüello felt it his duty to issue a bando or proclamation on the same subject. "Inasmuch," he announced to the people of the territory, "as it has come to my notice, that some individuals of this province, native or foreign, are in possession of seditious papers and books, particularly such as are against the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Faith and Religion, and against the government; and inasmuch as this is a matter over which we above all must watch, because we have inherited from our fathers this Faith which is the only one that leads to the salvation of our souls; in accord with the Rev. Fr. Presidente Vicente Francisco de Sarriá, I hereby ordain that, without any exception as to the persons who may dwell in this land, all deliver up said papers and books to the nearest pastor, so that he may examine whether they are forbidden or not, in order that he may decide concerning them what is most agreeable to our holy Religion, which we profess, etc." [23]

Only three months later, as Fr. Sarriá wrote to the Bishop

---

[22] Bishop Bernardo to Fr. Señan, October 31st, 1822; Fr. Señan, "Circular," May 12th, 1823. "Sta. Barb. Arch." See Appendix E.

[23] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., San José, iv, p. 62.

of Sonora, it was discovered that in the house of an Englishman named Arnel,[24] who generally lived at Monterey, but was then travelling through the country, there were three volumes of Voltaire, one of the vilest of vile French writers. Fr. Sarriá on receiving them consigned them to the flames.[25] That much damage was done by such works is evident from the conduct of the young men who composed the California legislative assemblies, and as governors unfortunately controlled the territory until driven out by the Americans. Such a total disregard for Religion and its ministers and for the rights of the Indians could never have actuated men who had learned even the rudiments of Religion thoroughly, and had not been saturated with the vile products of French infidels. That the morals of the readers of such anti-Christian works suffered correspondingly may be gathered from the biographical sketches furnished by Bancroft. It will there be seen, what we experience to the present day, that the loudest declaimers against the friars were likewise among the uncleanest as to private morals as well as the most unscrupulous in the matter of mission temporalities.

California was now to lose two of her most noble men, Fr. Comisario-Prefecto Mariano Payéras and Fr. Presidente José Señan. The former, after receiving the Sacraments repeatedly in his last illness, died at Mission Purisima Concepcion on April 28th, 1823, at the age of only fifty-three years, seven months, and eighteen days. The remains were

---

[24] William Hartnell, doubtless. He later joined the Catholic Church, as we have already stated elsewhere.

[25] Fr. Sarriá to Bishop Bernardo, April 19th, 1824. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, February 11th, 1824. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1592. This action gave Hittell an opportunity for a diatribe against the "intolerance" of the Catholic Church. Yet she has as much right as the State to safeguard her children against intellectual and moral poison. The United States Government, for instance, will not carry immoral matter through the mail. It is only the intolerant "Liberals" who rave at so wise a measure. Yet none are so intolerant as those very "Liberals" when they obtain control of the government.

buried next day under the pulpit of the mission church.[26] 'There was no missionary with whose public life and character for the past eight years the reader is better acquainted than with that of Fr. Payéras," says Bancroft.[27] "There was no friar of better and more even balanced ability in the province. He was personally a popular man on account of his affable manners, kindness of heart, and unselfish devotion to the welfare of all. It was impossible to quarrel with him, and even Governor Solá's peevish and annoying complaints never ruffled his temper. Yet he had extraordinary business ability, was a clear and forcible as well as a voluminous writer, and withal a man of great strength of mind and firmness of character. He was called to rule the friars during a trying period, when it would have required but a trifle to involve the padres and soldiers in a quarrel fatal to the missions. With much of Lasuén's suavity and none of Serra's bigotry (!), he had all the zeal of the latter and more than the shrewdness of the former. His death just at this time, in the prime of life, must be considered as a great misfortune."

The office of comisario prefecto ceased with the death of the incumbent, but Fr. José Señan as presidente now became the head of the missions. "Fr. Payéras," he writes in a circular announcing the death of the Fr. Prefect, "left us edifying examples of his love of God, piety, attachment to Religion, conformity to the divine will, and of all virtues. His death is therefore very much felt by all, especially by me, who for so long a time enjoyed so little health. Incomprehensible are the judgments of God, and unsearchable His ways. Just as I felt happy at the prospect of being relieved of the office of presidente by the coming chapter,

[26] Libro de Entierros of Mission Purisima.

[27] Vol. ii, 489-490. Though, ordinarily, extravagant praise from an infidel for a religious is exceedingly suspicious, we reproduce Bancroft's view of Fr. Payéras because in the main it happens to agree with the truth, barring the historian's uncalled-for fling at Fr. Serra, whom he hates with the animosity of a genuine Voltairian.

Viva Jesus, Maria, y José.

Estado Espiritual de las Misiones de la Alta California segun los Informes de 1824.

Nombres de las Misiones, y tiempo de sus fundaciones.	Bautismos administr.s en dho año.							Casam.tos en dho año.		Difuntos en dho año.		Neofitos existentes en fin de dho año.		
	Muchach.s	Adultos.	Hijos de Gentiles bautizados.	De Gentiles.	De Razon.	De Neofitos antiguos.	Son por todos.	De Indios.	De Razon.	Indios.	De Razon.	Hombres.	Mugeres.	Son por todos.
S.n Diego 16. Jul. 1769.	43.	88.	11.	46.	11.	20.	131.	23.	8.	66.	6.	904.	724.	1622.
S.n Luis Rey 13. Jun. 1798.	26.	138.	0	37.	4.	97.	164.	33.	1.	95.	3.	1358.	1273.	2631.
S.n Juan Capistrano 1.o Nov. 1776.	09.	50.	0	04.	2.	44.	59.	13.	1.	63.	2.	566.	484.	1050.
S.n Gabriel 6. Set. 1771.	43.	153.	0	51.	53.	49.	196.	22.	8.	123.	18.	872.	754.	1626.
S.n Fernando 8. Set. 1797.	7.	31.	0	01.	1.	29.	38.	21.	1.	46.	0	502.	516.	1018.
S.n Buenaventura 31. Mar. 1782.	1. Esclavo.	36.	0	0	2.	34.	36.	13.	0.	69.	2.	599.	493.	1092.
S.ta Barbara 4. Dic. 1786.	0	58.	0	2.	19.	37.	58.	19.	5.	133.	7.	574.	465.	1039.

Nuestra Señora de la Soledad 9. Oct. 1794.	20.	19.	0	9.	0	10.	39.	19.	0	26.	1.	298.	152.	450.
S.r Carlos 28. Agos. 1770.	1.	43.	0	0	23.	20.	44.	11.	6.	26.	12.	200.	174.	374.
S.r Juan Bautista 24. Jun. 1797.	206.	165.	7.	98.	12.	48.	371.	87.	1.	104.	6.	563.	535.	1098.
Santa Cruz 28. Agos. 1794.	64.	33.	0	14.	6.	13.	97.	42.	1.	34.	0.	305.	214.	519.
S.ta Clara 18. Enc. 1777.	75.	59.	12.	0	15.	32.	134.	52.	6.	90.	13.	814.	577.	1388.
S.r S.t José 14. Jun. 1797.	105.	63.	4.	0	0	59.	168.	35.	0	168.	0	929.	825.	1754.
N. P. S.t Francisco 9. Oct. 1776.	434.	209.	0	158.	14.	37.	623.	167.	2.	157.	2.	1015.	786.	1801.
Totales en 1821.	1021.	1275.	34.	422.	168.	674.	2316.	618.	44.	1444.	74.	11576.	7620.	21196.
Totales desde el establecimiento.						72465.=		17807.=		4774.		Existian en 1820.		
												11203.	7107.	20086.

D. José Señan

and thus enjoying somewhat more tranquillity during the last years of my life, as I had supplicated, I see myself assaulted by that from which I tried to flee; and what my soul would not touch, now to my anguish has become my food. Be it so for the love of God, and mayest Thou, O Lord, do as Thou wilt on earth as in heaven. . . I direct Your Reverences all to apply the twenty holy Masses according to our compact for the soul of the deceased." [28]

Fr. Señan survived Fr. Payéras only four months, for he too passed to his reward from his Mission San Buenaventura on August 24th, 1823. He had reached the age of sixty-three years, five months, and twenty-one days. The body was laid to rest in the sanctuary of the mission church on the next day.[29] At the time of his death he was the only one of the friars who had come to California before 1790. Bancroft says "he was a model missionary, resembling Payéras in many of his excellencies, but unlike the latter shrinking from the cares and responsibilities of official life. He was the superior of Payéras in scholarship, his equal in the qualities that make a successful missionary, but inferior as a politician and leader, and somewhat more of a *religioso* [30] than was Payéras. He disliked to issue orders or assume authority, but was always ready to respond to the frequent calls of his confreres for advice. He was sometimes nicknamed Padre Calma.[31] He was familiar with the language of the Indians about San Buenaventura. During his first term as presidente he managed the interests of the missions with much skill."[32]

---

[28] Fr. J. Señan, "Circular," April 29th, 1823. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Fr. Señan to Argüello, April 29th, May 6th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1443; 1444.

[29] Libro de Entierros of Mission San Buenaventura. Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, September 7th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1466.

[30] That is why Bancroft found such lavish praise for Fr. Payéras; but the historian misunderstood Fr. Payéras altogether. Fr. Señan's report describes Fr. Payéras's character correctly.

[31] for his even temper. Bancroft, ii, 491. We have not found the appellation anywhere else.

[32] During the second term Fr. Payéras ranked him as comisario and attended to the external government of the missions.

Most Rev. Fr. Bestard, Commissary-General of the Indies, in 1818 directed Fr. Señan to write a history of the California missions, but it is not known what progress he made if any on this task.[33] We have discovered nothing that indicated a beginning on the work. On August 14th just after receiving Extreme Unction, Fr. Señan dictated a long letter to Fr. Blas Ordáz, who attended the dying Fr. Presidente. The document was addressed to Fr. Ex-Comisario-Prefecto Vicente de Sarriá, and named him presidente ad interim.[34]

---

[33] Fr. J. B. Bestard to Fr. Guardian López, August 29th, 1818; Fr. López to Fr. Señan, April 26th, 1819. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[34] Fr. Señan to Argüello, August 13th; Fr. Señan to Fr. Sarriá, August 14th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1457, 1458. Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, September 7th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1466. Bancroft, ii, 491, has things mixed with regard to the succession. Fr. Sarriá was merely presidente until the College named a successor. The office could of right not belong to Fr. Jaime, unless he had been named vice-presidente by the College. Of this there is no evidence. Nor is it likely, for Fr. Jaime was crippled with rheumatism and always ailing.

CHAPTER XI.

Fr. Altimira's Intrigues.—A Usurping Deputation.—Missions to be Suppressed.—Fr. Altimira Founds a New Mission.—Amazement of the Fr. Presidente.—Fr. Altimira Proceeds with the Buildings.—Receives Fr. Sarriá's Letter.—His Wrath.—Fr. Sarriá Lays Down the Law to Argüello.—Compromise.—San Francisco and San Rafael Saved.—Fr. Altimira not Happy.—The First Legislature in Second Session.—Imposes Taxes.—Discriminates Against the Indians.—Fr. Abella's Protest.—Fr. Sarriá's Firm Stand.—Intolerable Oppression.—Kotzebue and Estudillo.—Fr. Sarriá Enlightens Argüello.—Sad Condition of the Missions.—Fr. Sarriá Warns the Governor.

THE first important matter which engaged the attention of Fr. Sarriá was the unauthorized founding of a new mission in the north and the attempted suppression of the missions of San Francisco and San Rafael. The sterility of the soil, the severity of the climate, and the prospect of numerous conversions, appealed to Fr. José Altimira, a new-comer stationed at San Francisco, as sufficient reasons for removing his neophytes to a locality north of San Rafael. He found a sympathetic supporter of the plan in Governor Argüello, who until lately had been commander of the presidio on the bay. The proposition had been argued before Comisionado Fernández and Fr. Prefecto M. Payéras during their visit in October, 1822. Fr. Altimira claimed that on this occasion Fr. Payéras had given his consent, and entrusted the petitioner, Fr. Altimira, with the transfer of the mission and the choice of a new site. This is scarcely possible, because the question could not be decided one way or the other without the approbation of the College of San Fernando. Nor would the late Fr. Comisario have determined the question without consulting the Fr. Presidente, because the other missions usually had to contribute live-stock, implements, and other goods. Certain it is, that the inexperienced and somewhat conceited young friar, at the instigation of

Governor Argüello, Bancroft thinks, on March 23rd, 1823, drew up a memorial urging the transfer of Mission San Francisco. It was presented to the first territorial legislature at Monterey in April.[1]

The diputacion or legislative assembly of six men, who really had nothing to do with the matter, on April 9th not only voted in favor of the change, but decreed that the mission station of San Rafael should also be removed and with Mission San Francisco located on a new site in the country of the Petalumas or of the Canicaïmos, in other words, that both should be suppressed and a new mission started. The diputacion went further, and proposed the suppression of the missions of Santa Cruz and San Carlos, but failed to agree.[2] These measures were all beyond the province of the half dozen men who composed the assembly; for the missions were ecclesiastical institutions, under governmental protection, it is true, but not governmental establishments. At any rate, as Fr. Sarriá remarked, the decrees had no binding force until approved by the Mexican government, to which Argüello referred them next day.

When Fr. Amorós of San Rafael heard of the resolution to suppress his post, where he was feeding, clothing, and instructing eight hundred Indian converts, he on May 17th sent a protest to Governor Argüello against the transfer which he declared unreasonable and unjust, in that the late Fr. Comisario-Prefecto, during his visit on October 19th, 1822, had decreed that San Rafael in everything should be

---

[1] Fr. Altimira to Fr. Señan, July 10th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1463. Bancroft thinks it not improbable that the real motive of Argüello and Canon Fernández was to throw the few fertile ranchos south of San Francisco into the hands of settlers.

[2] Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Señan, April 23rd, 1823. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Those paisano politicians began the work of "reform" quite early. They had read their political catechism thoroughly and felt themselves above the Church already. What follows are only developments on the same line.

MISSION SAN FRANCISCO SOLANO, FOUNDED JULY 4th, 1823.

independent of Mission San Francisco.[3] Nevertheless, without waiting for the approval of the Fr. Presidente, now that Fr. Payéras had passed away, Fr. Altimira [4] with Francisco Cástro, one of the six deputies, and nineteen men under Ensign José Sánchez, embarked on June 25th for the purpose of establishing the proposed mission. They spent the night at San Rafael, and next day set out to explore the country for a favorable site. They went by way of Olompali, examined the valleys of Petaluma, Sonoma, Napa, and Suisun, and finally on July 3rd returned to Sonoma. Here they determined to locate the new establishment, because they thought the place best adapted by reason of its climate, abundance of timber, stone, and water. Fr. Altimira next morning raised and blessed the cross and site, celebrated holy Mass, and thus on July 4th, albeit illegally, laid the foundation for the new Mission of San Francisco. "All the people were told," he writes highly elated to Fr. Señan, "that in future this place would be called 'New San Francisco'." The expedition then returned to Mission Dolores where on July 16th the friar dated his diary and report.[5]

If the Fr. Presidente was amazed at the summary and illegal manner in which the legislative assembly had disposed of the subject of mission founding and mission suppression without consulting the Supreme Government in Mexico, as he wrote to Fr. Sarriá, he was fairly astounded at the audacity of Fr. Altimira. While he lay dying at San Buenaventura, Fr. Señan on August 14th dictated to Fr. Blas Ordáz a long letter full of minute instructions for Fr. Sarriá. The document may be called his testament, for he died ten

---

[3] "Queda esta en todo independiente de la Mision de N. P. S. Francisco." Fr. Amorós to Argüello, May 17th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1447. See also Fr. Amorós to Argüello, June 26th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1453.

[4] He claimed that Argüello had ordered him to proceed at once to plan the mission, which, of course, was no excuse, as in such things he was not subject to the governor.

[5] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1463. Altimira, "Diario."—"California Mss." Bancroft Collection.

days later. Concerning the transfer of Mission San Francisco, on account of the roughness of the climate, he said that he was not averse to it, but that he considered the manner as striking at authority. For the rest he directed Fr. Sarriá to do what he thought proper.[6]

After consulting with Fr. Estévan Tápis and Narciso Durán at San Juan Bautista, Fr. Vicente de Sarriá accordingly wrote to Fr. Altimira as follows: "I have learned with regret what Your Reverence has done in attempting to found the new Mission of San Francisco. By order of the Rev. Fr. Presidente José Señan, who is now so grievously ill that he is incapacitated to govern the missions, I shall have to act in his place in accordance with his circular which has made the rounds of the missions. Nevertheless I have not wished to take any steps until the subject was discussed in keeping with our regulations. For this purpose various Fathers and myself have assembled to-day at this mission. According to their judgment as well as mine, I have to say that Your Reverence is not lawfully authorized to undertake said founding of a mission, and that consequently you expose the spiritual functions of your ministry to nullification, because the faculties which we have are *in locis a suis superioribus assignatis*.[7] Such is the declaration of the Bull of Pius V. on this point. Your Reverence cannot defend your action with the alleged will of the Rev. Fr. Prefecto, God rest his soul, which did not touch the present transaction of designating time and place, nor did it extend to the topographical site of the founding, or the sending of Your Reverence to such a distance without an associate contrary to canonical and civil laws and in opposition to the statutes of our Apostolic College. I do not know that there is among the Fathers one who approves of your way of proceeding. It will cause much grief at our College when it is informed

[6] Fr. Señan to Fr. Sarriá, August 14th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1458.

[7] "for places assigned by their Superiors."

about the matter. My dear Father, no one perhaps will surpass me in zeal for extending the glory of the Holy Name of the Lord by means of the light of His Holy Gospel; but Your Reverence knows that this zeal must be *secundum scientiam*.[8] If it must be against charity and its sweet fruit—peace, then let us put it aside or at least postpone it, the former[9] for the sake of the latter[10] which is more necessary."[11]

Meanwhile at the end of July Argüello asked Fr. Altimira why he had not effected the transfer of Mission Dolores. He was told that it was impossible to begin operations without the neophytes of San Rafael, because the number of those at Mission San Francisco was not half sufficient. Fr. Altimira also went to Monterey, hardly with the permission of his prelate, to consult with the governor. Argüello directed him not to await the Superior's orders, but to make a beginning at once. On August 4th Argüello also sent communications of similar import to Fr. Presidente Señan, to Fr. Amorós of San Rafael, and to the comandante of the presidio of San Francisco. Strange to relate, Fr. Altimira on August 12th accompanied Lieutenant Ignacio Martínez across the bay, took possession of the mission property by inventory, and returned to Mission Dolores. On the 23rd he started out for Sonoma with an escort of twelve men, who carried five hundred cartridges, an artilleryman who was to manage a cannon of two pound calibre, and a force of neophyte laborers. They arrived at New San Francisco on the 25th of August, and at once began work on a granary, irrigating ditch, corral, and other necessary structures. Good progress

---

[8] "according to wisdom."

[9] glory for the Holy Name.

[10] charity. "Non potest aedificari regnum Dei super ruinam charitatis," Pope Piux X. declares. With this Fr. Sarriá's counsel is quite in accord.

[11] Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Altimira, August 23d, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1461.

was made for a week, when on August 31st Fr. Sarriá's letter just quoted changed the situation.[12]

Bancroft describes Fr. Altimira's state of mind after the receipt of Fr. Sarriá's letter as "furious." The terms and tone of a long, wild communication which the self-willed



Signature of Fr. José Altimira.

young friar addressed to Governor Argüello on the same day justifies the word. Recounting what had occurred, and that he was obliged to interrupt the work, he complained most bitterly of the way in which he had been treated, and of the "frivolous difficulties" put in the way by the missionary of an unprofitable *asistencia*[13] through "underhand efforts," and the aid of "confederate padres." The Fr. Presidente[14] he goes on, had obstinately kept silent, though not worse in health than usual and perfectly able[15] to confirm the orders of his predecessor. The confederates were all blind to the circumstances and had exerted themselves in the office of Satan by throwing obstacles in the way of a great enterprise, especially Fr. Durán.[16] The new presidente, too, seemed to be one of the plotters, inasmuch as he had complained that his permission should have been awaited, though all might have died before it came. The angry young friar then concluded in substance as follows: "I wish to know whether the diputacion has any authority in this prov-

---

[12] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap. xi, 546; Missions ii, 269; Bancroft, ii, 500-501.

[13] He was wrong; San Rafael was a mission at this date.

[14] Bancroft has "prefect." There was no prefect at the time.

[15] When Fr. Altimira wrote Fr. Señan had already expired.

[16] He was the missionary of Mission San José.

ince, and if these men can overthrow Your Honor's wise provision.[17] I came here to convert gentiles and to establish new missions. If I cannot do it here, where as we all agree is the best spot in California for the purpose, I will leave the country." [18]

In reply to his assumptions Fr. Sarriá from San Juan Bautista, where he had held a conference with Fr. Tápis and other Fathers, addressed a long letter of eight pages folio to the governor. The main points are the following. After explaining that as presidente ad interim he disliked to give positive orders, he insists 1st, that the New Constitution of Mexico does not change the old laws and usages which intrusted the whole matter of founding, suppressing, or moving of missions and the appointment of missionaries to the respective prelate, and that therefore the diputacion had no authority on the subject.—2nd. The original decree of the diputacion provided that Mission San Francisco along with San Rafael should be transferred to the country of the Petalumas or of the Canicaïmos, whereas now without consulting the Superior of the missions another locality is selected at the word of one friar. What would Captain Argüello say if in military matters at the dictates of a private soldier, and he a visionary, the location of a fortification settled by the military authorities were changed?—3rd. Through the transfer a wrong is committed against the neophytes of San Rafael, who, now under the new order of things being citizens and on an equality with white men,

---

[17] A right "liberal" view of State authority. It would seem from this, and the charges Fr. Altimira makes against Fathers Durán and Amorós, that untamed passion and baffled vanity had deprived the young man of his reason temporarily. He showed that the "glory of the Holy Name" had not been the prime motive for wanting to start a mission.

[18] Fr. Altimira to Argüello, August 31st, 1823. We use Bancroft's version very much because Fr. Altimira's communications were written on the poorest paper and in places almost illegible when we examined them. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1464; Bancroft, ii, 501-502.

are forced to leave their birthplace, their lands, their houses, and the missionary whom they love, though unanimously opposed to the removal.—4th. There is a great lack of missionaries which makes it impossible to assign two Fathers to so distant a place where it is unsafe for a friar to live alone.—5th. Even if Fr. Payéras had approved of the transfer on general principles, it would be an insult to his memory to suppose that he would have approved of such violent ways of effecting it.—6th. Neither Fr. Payéras nor Canónigo Fernández ever approved the transfer of San Rafael; on the contrary both had promised the neophytes a new church.—7th. Fr. Presidente Señan, the representative of the bishop, had entertained the same views as the writer, and was much astounded at the proceedings. "What a labyrinth! Political authorities assuming the functions of a bishop.—8th. It may be said that application was made to the prelate. So did Henry VIII. apply to the Pope for approval of his unholy union, but he obtained no favorable reply; neither did Fr. Altimira."—9th. Nevertheless, Fr. Altimira is not accused of bad faith because letters are known to have been delayed on the way.—10th. Too much weight should not be laid upon the representations of one friar unsupported by his prelate and associates.—11th. All the Fathers are zealous for the conversion of the pagan Indians, but they wish it to be accomplished in an orderly manner.[19]

In reply Argüello, without attempting to answer Fr. Sarriá's arguments, endeavored to excuse his measures by the inactivity of the Fathers, in that during fifty years they had not made any progress in the conversion of the northern gentiles. Now the secular authority proposed to take charge of the conquest in its temporal aspects at least.[20] "Yet, positive as was the governor's tone in general," Bancroft remarks,[21] "he declared that he would not insist on the sup-

[19] Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, September 5th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1465. The document is in the hand of Fr. Tápis; Fr. Sarriá signed it. See also Bancroft, ii, 502-503.

[20] Bancroft, ii, 503.

[21] Vol. ii, 503.

pression of San Rafael, and he seems to have consented readily enough to a compromise suggested by the Fr. Presidente." By the terms of this arrangement the Fr. Presidente allowed the new foundation to continue as a mission, though he declared the action of the diputacion a "grave injury contrary to the regular order."[22] He also appointed Fr. Altimira the regular missionary of the new mission subject to the approval of the College; but neither Old San Francisco nor San Rafael should be suppressed. Moreover Fr. Altimira should continue associate missionary of the former. Neophytes might voluntarily go from Old San Francisco to the new establishment, and also from San José and San Rafael, provided they had originally come from the Sonoma region, and provided also that in the case of San Rafael the neophytes might return at any time within a year. New converts might come from any direction and join the mission which they preferred.[23]

Thereupon Fr. Altimira was permitted to take up his quarters at Sonoma; but he was not entirely satisfied. To his friend, the governor, he complained about the neighboring missionaries (especially Fr. Durán whom he wanted silenced), because they would not furnish all the customary aid. He wanted some show of military power to inspire the gentiles with respect. Too much liberty, he also thought, was granted to the neophytes in the matter of choosing their abode. All this shows that the independence[24] for which he apparently had longed failed to bring the happiness which he had expected. Nor need we wonder that good Fr. Sarriá had to report that Indians were running away from Sonoma, because they disliked Fr. Altimira's ways.[25] Details about this

---

[22] "grave injuria contra el debido orden que la rige."

[23] Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, September 12th; 30th, 1823. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1467; 1475.

[24] He desired, it seems, what the friars had thus far dreaded—to live alone.

[25] Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, October 18th, 1823. Bancroft, ii, 504.

last of the California missions will be found in the local annals, however.

Returning to the civil affairs of the territory we have to relate that, on the receipt of the news of Iturbide's overthrow in Mexico, Governor Argüello again assembled the diputacion at Monterey on January 7th, 1824. It was composed of the same deputies that had formed the legislative assembly in the previous year, save that José Castro took the place of Ortega, and that Secretary Haro was supplanted by José Joaquín de la Torre. The military commanders José de la Guerra, José Mariano Estrada, José Ramírez, and Santiago Argüello also took part; but though Fr. Presidente Sarriá was stationed within six miles of Monterey he was not invited to the deliberation as on a former occasion. After voting down a proposition to join a federation which was to embrace Nueva Vizcaya, New Mexico, and both Californias, the diputacion on January 8th adopted a kind of constitution or plan for the government of the internal affairs of Upper California. This provisional constitution contained four titles: Government, Military Force, Revenues and Expenditures, and Judiciary. It was accordingly resolved that in the future, besides the governor, the legislative assembly should be composed of the six deputies, two military officers, and the Superior of the missions.[26] The governor was to receive a salary of $2500. The salary of each captain was fixed at $1200, and the members of the assembly should be entitled to $1.00 a day while in attendance away from their homes. The secretary was allowed $270 a year.

With regard to the revenues, besides the duties from imports and exports, the colonists were taxed twelve per cent. as well as the missions on all their produce and live-stock. The settlers might pay in kind, but the missions had to pay at the rate of $1.50 per head for all branded cattle; $2.00 per

[26] So the twenty-one missions with their 25,000 neophytes, who furnished the bulk of the California revenues, were allowed just one representative! No wonder Fr. Sarriá was not permitted to have a voice in the framing of this wonderful constitution! The missions enjoyed the privilege of paying nearly all the taxes.

fanega of wheat; $1.50 per fanega of corn; $2.50 per fanega of beans; $8.00 per barrel of wine; and $35 per barrel of brandy. The assembly graciously condescended to exempt from taxation church goods and the personal effects of the Fathers.[27] As the latter possessed absolutely nothing but their breviaries, the coarse habits which they wore, and their rosaries, the assembly could hardly act otherwise in this respect.

The missionaries and their Indian wards might have enjoyed life somewhat, if those in power had been satisfied with taxing the missions like themselves or other inhabitants of the territory. Now that the Spanish laws, which privileged the missions as ecclesiastical or semi-ecclesiastical institutions for the spread of Religion, seemed to have lost their force, the Fathers were content to be treated like the white settlers on the subject of taxes; but such happiness was not to be theirs. The reader may judge for himself. "What I supplicate is," writes Fr. Abella of San Carlos to the diputacion, "that upon this mission the same burden be placed as upon the white people and nothing more; that the



Signature of Fr. Ramón Abella.

same liberty of managing it be left to me as any other settler desires for himself. He is permitted to control what is his.

[27] "El vecindario podrá pagarlo en la propia especie, pero las misiones han de satisfacer por cada res 12 reales; por fanega de trigo 2 pesos; por fanega de maiz 12 reales; por fanega de frijol 20 rl.; por barril de vino, 8 pesos; por barril de aguardiente, 35 pesos; advirtiendo que queda exento de todo derecho lo que corresponde al bien eclesiastico por razon de la imunidad, tanto los efectos que se dediquen á la iglesia como los que sean destinados para la existencia de los Padres Ministros de ellas." "Acta de la Diputacion," Sesion de 8 Enero, 1824. "Cal. Arch.," Dept. St. Pap., San José, iv, 41-44. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

When the colonist pays the taxes allotted to him, he is not further molested; no other demand is made upon him, and no circular exposing the needs of the soldiery is passed around to him. The Indians are content if they are not more molested than the settlers. Thus far, however, in no public work at the presidio have the colonists been taken into account in the least, much less forced. Nor are others troubled who pass their life in idleness and in criticizing and in annoying others. I therefore ask that we be treated alike in every emergency." [28]

Fr. Abella's remonstrance covers three pages folio. The preceding extract shows the drift of his complaint. The good Father was a hard worker, and withal a quiet man who devoted himself entirely to the welfare of his neophytes. The conditions must have been wretched, indeed, if they could wring from him a direct appeal to the legislative assembly. Of course, his supplications were in vain, for those deputies like their successors seem to have regarded the missions as their legitimate prey. Since the dictates of the Religion which they professed never guided their deliberations, but only selfishness, we need wonder at nothing that they resolved upon in subsequent years, nor that they had recourse to slandering the missionaries in order to clothe their acts in the garb of righteousness.

Under such circumstances it was but natural that the Fathers should sigh for deliverance from such a state of things; but the authorities appear to have held the opinion that the friars had not even the right of complaining. Governor Argüello must have learned the sentiments prevailing among them, for on March 16th, 1824, he called the attention of Fr. Sarriá to the expressions used by some of the friars. In reply the Fr. Presidente wrote: "I have to say in return that those mentioned in your letter are not the only ones who have expressed themselves in such bitter terms

[28] "Pido que seamos iguales en qualquiera otra faena." Fr. Abella to the Diputacion, October 17th, 1824. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1609.

with regard to the bad spirit of the new regulations. There are others who ask for permission to retire, and who want to renounce a service which they cannot exercise without subjecting the neophytes to hard slavery, or to a condition even worse than that; for slavery does not deny the necessary food at least to human beings who *by nature and by law are free,* such as are the Indians. In consequence of said legislation we see them deprived of the first means of living, inasmuch as they are compelled to give it to others." Fr. Sarriá continues in the same strain through nine octavo pages, and follows up his remonstrance with a disquisition on human rights according to moral law.[29]

The following is a specimen demand which drove the missionaries nearly to distraction, and which made them feel themselves regarded as merely so many plantation overseers serving for the benefit of insolent troops and inconsiderate would-be statesmen, rather than as messengers of the Gospel and spiritual fathers of their converts. "In said year," Fr. Durán on December 1st, 1824, wrote to Fr. Sarriá,[30] "the mission (San José) has delivered to the governor's storehouse alone soap, shoes, mantéca, corn, and wheat to the value of $1300.[31] This does not include the rations to the mission guards and other expenses which amount to quite a sum. Yet we are accused of obstinately refusing to pay the taxes and duties imposed in April of the past year, 1823! The tax of one real per head for five hundred cattle which we slaughtered since April to the end of the year amounted to $62.50. Hence the mission is heavily burdened."

How little the exertions of the friars touched the governor and the deputies, who found themselves clothed with a little brief authority, may be gathered from the impression Kotzebue received during his second visit to San Francisco,

[29] Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, March 22nd, 1824. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1598.

[30] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1614.

[31] "La misión en dicho año entregó á la habilitación el valor de mil trescientos pesos largos en solo jabón, zapatos, manteca, maiz, y trigo."

October 8th to December 6th, 1824. For the institutions of the country and the mission system in particular he has nothing but condemnation. The missionaries had no good quality but hospitality. The neophytes were simply slaves, captured in their homes with the lasso and dragged into the missions to toil, until relieved by death, under tyrannical masters who treated them worse than cattle. Naturally the lowest race on the face of the earth, the Indians were still further degraded by the iniquities of the mission system under the hypocritical pretense of conversion to Christianity. "Kotzebue's exaggeration and prejudice," even Bancroft is constrained to say, "on these points are apparent;" [32] but when we learn that on his trip to Fort Ross, Kotzebue was accompanied by Lieutenant José Maria Estudillo, *"a bitter foe of the padres,"* [33] as Bancroft remarks, the navigator's wild description is explained. Estudillo also accused the friars to the Russian Kotzebue "of consulting only their own interest, and of employing their proselytes as a means of laying up wealth for themselves, with which, when acquired, they return to Spain." [34] Kotzebue on his own account, however, makes this statement: "The Spaniards [35] are an ignorant, indolent, good-for-nothing people." [36]

The insolence of the California officials finally threatened to drive the missionaries out of the country, so that Fr.

---

[32] Bancroft, ii, 524. It is likely that many writers obtained their knowledge of the mission system from this muddy fountain.

[33] "Who seems to have given the traveler some absurdly inaccurate information about the province, and also led our author far astray respecting the political situation." Bancroft, ii, 523-525.

[34] Bancroft, ii, 517. This infamous charge, for which there is not a shred of evidence, sufficiently characterizes Estudillo. The traducers began early to cast their covetous eyes on the property of the Christian Indians.

[35] He means shiftless Mexican soldiers and settlers, with whom the real Spaniards had little in common but the language. As for this Estudillo, Bancroft (vol. ii, 794) says, "Estudillo had some disagreeable qualities—notably that of vanity—which made him heartily disliked by his brother officers."

[36] Bancroft, ii, 524.

Sarriá, at the end of the year, respectfully yet firmly represented the intolerable situation to Governor Argüello as follows: "The Fathers of San Diego," he wrote, "have shown themselves very willing [37] to contribute in behalf of their missions whatever is necessary for the troops; but they have unanimously protested that it is impossible to do so with all the notoriously exorbitant taxes demanded during this year, besides others which it is intended to impose, contrary to the will of the Mexican Government. The diputacion in open session has heard the remonstrance made on this subject on the part of Mission San Gabriel. Hence, in the face of the feeling thus aroused by such taxation I do not promise myself the bare subsistence for the Fathers of those missions, who considering it impossible to raise such taxes will seek with more success [38] to retire to some part outside the territory where they can exercise their ministry in peace. Not long ago I received formal complaints from the Fathers of both missions on the subject of such forced contributions which were then demanded by the habilitado of San Diego. At the same time I was informed of their determination to leave the service. Those of San Gabriel were especially emphatic in expressing their resolution, because they could not perform their duty with all the exactions of the territorial government.

"I also draw your attention to the misapprehension contained in your communication regarding the abundance of the crops. As far as Mission San Juan Capistrano is concerned, it may be said that it has had no wheat crop, as I myself can testify because I was there for some time. In the year before, 1823, they harvested only twenty-four fanegas of that grain. Of all other kinds of grain they harvested only a quantity which if distributed would allow

[37] Fr. Viadér of Santa Clara also wrote to Fr. Sarriá on December 1st, 1824: "Esta mision nunca ha rehusado absolutamente ó totalmente pagar dichos derechos." "Archb. Arch.," no. 1613.

[38] He intimates that he will not prevent their departure, as they long had served out their term. They only staid for the sake of the Indians.

but two fanegas to each individual in the mission, as may be seen from the official reports, so that there will be none left for planting nor any oxen to do the ploughing. If for this there are no animals how will there be any for transporting the grain? Fr. Sánchez of San Diego informs me under date of December 9th to this effect: "Here we have fared badly. The water came down so that we could not gather all the grain, and everything was repeatedly soaked." Heavy rains also visited Mission San Gabriel and damaged the crops before they could be sheltered. I will not undertake to remove the very erroneous notions entertained by many regarding the products of the missions. Let all study the reports of the respective mission, when it will be seen how much per head is coming to each hapless Indian.

"In most missions, if not in nearly all, after paying the taxes, tariff duties, and forced loans, scarcely enough remains to furnish each male individual with a shirt, a pair of breeches, and a coarse blanket, and each female with a coarse skirt of serge, in return for working continually in the manner that is evident to all. A great portion of the men, or most of them, go without being clad as decency requires—half naked. In some missions, and they are not few at present, owing to the great drought of the last two years, which caused the death of many sheep, there is no way of providing annualy, not even after eighteen months, blankets for the Indians, much less skirts for the women as natural decency demands. I exaggerate nothing, nor do I fear that any one can gainsay what I relate. What then in the world do they mean to extort from these unfortunates? On this point here they ought to provide for unfortunate persons as every enlightened government provides and is dictated by every law.[39]

"In the town of Los Angeles there are now already about one thousand souls of the people called *de razon,* with plenty of water for irrigation and abundant land which is equal to the best in the territory. Single individuals there

[39] Certainly no forced contribution is laid upon them.

possess ranchos which may compete with whole missions.[40] Now I ask, has the whole pueblo and have the ranchos contributed the least share towards defraying the cost of maintaining the troops of San Diego? It is quite likely that they have not even taken the trouble to molest the inhabitants of that pueblo in the least for the support of the military.

"The very same observation is made throughout the jurisdiction of the other presidios. At all these missions of the north, notwithstanding the extraordinarily exorbitant taxes, tariff duties, and tithes which must be paid in cash,[41] all has been paid, or will likely be paid, if not already paid; yet after all this, that is to say after the sacrifice of the very skin, is it the determination as a sacrifice to squeeze the very sap or marrow out of the substance?[42] Such it seems is the intention. Some missions north of here[43] have paid not only what was imposed upon them, but they have already experienced increased necessities by reason of what has thus been extorted from them in the present year. Nevertheless, from what I understand it is the intention to extort even more of that which is considered indispensable for feeding the neophytes. Where in all this is there consideration for the sacredness of each citizen's property? Where is there consideration for the very rights of the people?

"I am very far from believing that all this will meet the approval of the Mexican Government, if matters are explained as they are! Nay, on the contrary, it will adopt measures which every system of moderation dictates in order

---

[40] Yet the paisanos complained that the missions had too much land! It certainly belonged to the Indians, and even the United States Government respects these rights; it purchases the land from them, but does not steal it.

[41] "Derechos, diezmos impuestos en metálico." Colonists could pay in kind. This was another unjust discrimination.

[42] "Mas aun despues de todo ello, esto es, despues de sacrificada la piel, se querrá sacar en sacrificio todo el jugo ó medula interior de su substancia?"

[43] North of San Carlos.

to prevent the trampling upon the rights of each one, lest a kind of slavery be introduced which scarcely would find its equal.

"If, however, it is your intention for this purpose to use means that are violent and opposed to every law of moderation, I shall not sustain them, for the Mexican system of government does not uphold them. Surely not one of the Fathers will meet violence with violence, because such is not their spirit nor that of their Institute; but you run the risk that the missions and also the territory may be without priests, which in truth would be to me the most indescribable sorrow. I shall implore the Lord that it may not come to pass as I fear." [44]

Whatever may have been the intent of the temporary governor and his half dozen legislators, they at all events now knew with what men they were dealing, and that it was wise to make haste slowly. Thus at every stage the missionaries proved themselves the true friends of the Indian and shielded him at the cost of great hardship to themselves. Nor were the natives so dull as not to perceive as much. Hence their affection for the friars who alone could induce the neophytes to persevere and submit to oppression from the settlers and soldiers in the hope of a change for the better.

---

[44] Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, December 31st, 1824. "Archb. Arch," no. 1615.

CHAPTER XII.

Indian Revolt.—Immediate Cause.—Happenings at Santa Inés and Purisima.—Revolt Spreads to Santa Barbara.—Fr. Ripoll.—The Soldiers Attack the Indians.—Indians Retreat.—Brutality of the Soldiers.—Governor Sends Troops to Purisima.—Execution of Some Indians.—Santa Barbara Indians Flee to the Tulares.—Efforts to Bring Them Back.—Fr. Ripoll Distracted.—Fr. Sarriá Offers to Persuade Them.—Succeeds.—Change of Superiors in Mexico and California.—Junta de Fomento.—Minister Alaman to Fr. Guardian.—"God and Liberty."—Fr. Guardian's Reply to Alaman.

THE heartless calculation of the governor, his officers and the half-dozen legislators, and the exasperating insolence of the soldiers, not only oppressed the hearts of the missionaries, who with truly maternal solicitude looked after the wants of their Indian converts, but at last aroused the natives to turn upon their tormentors. Fr. Sarriá's pathetic protest only voiced the sentiments of the chafing neophytes. Early in the year 1824 the most widespread revolt in the history of the missions occurred, and might have easily put an end to white tyranny, had a leader been found to direct the movements of the enraged Indians, or had they received any encouragement from the friars.[1] Governor Argüello, as well as other Californians, indeed, attributed the rebellion to an attempt to free the country from the power of the whites and to reintroduce pagan liberty,[2] but the missionaries took the ground that the real cause was the ever-growing dis-

[1] "Si no les hubiera dado el golpe, yo creo positivamente que la California en el dia ya hubiera experimentado las mayores desgracias y los causantes Indios triunfantes." Argüello to Government, Monterey, April 21st, 1824. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. i, 578.

[2] "Por que su plan se ha averiguado no es otro que acabar con todos nosotros, esto es, con la gente de razon, y quedarse á su libertad antigua de su gentilismo." Argüello to the Government, Monterey, April 21st, 1824. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. i, 578.

content of the Indians "who bitterly complained that they had to work so that the soldiers might eat, and that nothing was paid them for their toil and their labor, whereas formerly they were compensated by means of the Memorias which made them happy but which had ceased since 1810." [3] The dissatisfaction was aggravated by petty acts of injustice, cruelty, and contempt on the part of the soldiery.

The immediate cause of the outbreak, however, was the flogging of a neophyte by order of a corporal named Cota at Santa Inés. The Indians of three missions then conspired to revenge themselves on a certain date, presumably Sexagesima Sunday, February 22nd, 1824. For some reason or the other the affray began on Saturday afternoon, February 21st, at Santa Inés. With bows and arrows the Indians attacked the soldiers, who with Fr. Francisco Javier Uría seem to have hastily retreated to a building in the rear of the church, whence they fired upon their assailants. The



Signature of Fr. Francisco X. Uría.

result of the skirmish was that an Indian from Mission Purisima and another from Santa Inés were killed. The rebels then set fire to the building which consumed it and the roof of the vestry, and had already reached the roof of the church before it could be extinguished. Fortunately, on the next day, Sergeant Anastasio Carrillo arrived with a small body of soldiers to reenforce the guards, though they had no knowledge of a conspiracy until they reached the mission. The rebels then retired to Purisima, and Fr. Uría escaped to Mission San Buenaventura, though we know only

[3] "Los Indios se quejan amargamente de que estan trabajando para que coman los soldados, y que nada se les paga de su sudor y su trabajo, que consiste en las libranzas citadas, que estan sin pagar desde 1810." Fr. Guardian López to Minister Alaman of Mexico, June 20th, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1739.

from hearsay that he had been included in the proposed massacre. [4]

On the same Saturday afternoon the Indians of Purisima aided by the fugitives of Santa Inés surrounded the mission into which the soldiers and their families had taken refuge with Fr. Antonio Rodríguez and Fr. Blas Ordáz. Corporal Tibúrcio Tapia with his four or five men kept the rebels at bay through the night. Only one Indian was killed, and of the besieged a woman was wounded. Unfortunately the ammunition of the soldiers gave out, but, owing probably to the intercession of the Fathers, Tapia with his men and their families were promised immunity if they surrendered. Fr. Ordáz on the following day, Sunday, accompanied the Spaniards with their wives and children to Santa Inés, under instructions from the Indians to warn Carrillo not to come to Purisima. Fr. Rodríguez remained with the neophytes as a nominal prisoner, but he was treated with the usual respect.[5] While the excitement lasted, four other men were killed who unaware of the revolt arrived at the mission on their way to Los Angeles. They were Dolores Sepúlveda, Ramon Sotélo, Simon Colíma, and Mansísidor de Loreto.[6] The Indians now prepared to defend themselves by erecting palisade fortifications, cutting loop-holes in the adobe walls of the church and other buildings, mounting two swivel guns which had been used to make appropriate noise on the feast days, and to send messages to gentiles and neophytes elsewhere, but it was nearly a month before an enemy appeared.

---

[4] The story was circulated, and is believed at Santa Inés and Santa Barbara to this day, that on retreating Fr. Uría was followed by an Indian who tried to kill the Father; that Fr. Uría turned and shot his aggressor dead; that for this deed, though committed in self-defense, he was suspended for a whole year at San Buenaventura. There is no documentary evidence. Fr. Uría was stationed at Soledad in November of the same year as missionary in charge.

[5] Bancroft, ii, 527-529.

[6] Libro de Entierros, Purisima.

Meanwhile the rebels of Santa Inés had sent a messenger to Santa Barbara early on Sunday morning.[7] The Indian informed the neophyte alcalde Andrés of the mission that Santa Inés Mission and the guardhouse had been burned down, the soldiers killed, and Fr. Uría with the survivors locked in their rooms; that a courier had brought the news to Purisima, and that the result there was probably the same, as the Indians of both places acted in harmony; that he should notify the Indians of San Buenaventura and direct them to take up arms as well as those at Santa Barbara, because the soldiers would come and avenge the death of their comrades; and that, if the Indians at Santa Barbara did not heed, those of Santa Inés would come and punish them. Andrés indeed hurried a messenger to San Buenaventura, but the Indian alcalde there was loyal. He apprised the corporal of the guard who imprisoned the bearer of the news, and thus that mission was spared the bloody scenes enacted at the other missions.

When Fr. Ripoll learned what had happened he endeavored to quiet his people. He said he must go down to the presidio to celebrate holy Mass and would speak to the comandante so that no soldiers might come up. He made them promise to do nothing wrong, and then proceeded on his way. While in the garrison he learned that the neophytes were arming themselves. He therefore sent his Indian boy servant with the request that the three head Indians should come down and talk the matter over with De la Guerra. They refused under the pretext that they feared harm would come to them there; they should rather see the comandante come up with the Father. This De la Guerra

---

[7] Bancroft has Monday morning, and that the revolt started on Sunday afternoon. This is unintelligible. February 21st plainly was a Saturday. Fr. Ripoll would not likely have gone down to the presidio for holy Mass on a Monday, unless it were a feast day, which it was not. Mrs. Ord also has correct date. "El tumulto fué el 22 de Febrero, 1824."—"Ocurrencias."

BATTLE IN FRONT OF MISSION SANTA BARBARA, FEBRUARY 22nd, 1824.

declined to do. At the request of Fr. Ripoll, however, he wrote out an order directing the mission guards, only three men, to retire to the presidio in order to convince the neophytes of the good will of the comandante. The Father found a crowd of excited Indians in front of the mission, all armed with bows and arrows. He asked Andrés for the reason of this display. The alcalde then presented an aged Indian by the name of Fulgencio, who lived in a straw-hut near the presidio. "You see, Father, this poor man. Two soldiers have arrested him, and he knows not why. On this account we take up arms, only to defend ourselves; but we will do nothing if the soldiers stay away." "I spoke to them kindly," Fr. Ripoll writes, "and tried to dissuade them. They listened respectfully without offering the least irreverence; but knowing that they still felt distrustful, because they saw the three soldiers with muskets at their quarters, I said to them, Come with me to the guardhouse. They all followed me. There I gave the guards the written order which directed them to withdraw to the presidio. Unfortunately, in a crowd there are never wanting some audacious individuals despite the care of the leaders. As the soldiers were about to march off, one of the Indians exclaimed: 'Let them leave their muskets behind; they should go away without their weapons.' At the same time some of the neophytes snatched the guns from the hands of the soldiers, and two of the three who resisted were slightly wounded with a cutlass. This was the worst offense they committed."

Fr. Ripoll accompanied the soldiers to the presidio, but the affront now brought up De la Guerra with a body of troops. The Indians received them with a volley from a few firearms and with a shower of arrows whilst they endeavored to shield themselves behind the pillars of the corridor. After exchanging bullets and arrows for three hours, De la Guerra ordered his men to retire "for what reason to this very moment I do not know," Fr. Ripoll wrote two

months after.[8] "At all events the soldiers did not reappear until late in the afternoon. Meanwhile the neophytes had the mayordomo open the warehouse and other rooms to take out all the clothing they could carry. Some entered the



Signature of Fr. Antonio Jayme.

wine cellar, but left the casks untouched. They locked the church and vestry without disarranging anything or troubling the people who had come for holy Mass, and then brought the keys to Fr. Antonio Jayme who lay sick abed. Even the little wine cruet which had already been filled for the next holy Mass they brought to the Father. They moreover begged him to come with them; that they would carry him and take care of him. With his customary smile, however, he replied that he was hungry and would go down to the presidio to take a bite. It must have been about three or four o'clock in the afternoon when I sent him my Indian boy with a gentle horse. The rebel Indians themselves lifted him upon the horse, and the boy seizing the halter led the animal with the infirm Fr. Antonio to the presidio." Mrs. Ord relates that two Indians brought the sick friar to her father's house, and that in spite of the tumult the Indians had not forgotten to attend to his meals.[9] As to the neophytes, they left their dwellings with all their

[8] Bancroft and Hittéll on the authority of Osio relate that when the hour of noon came De la Guerra took off his hat, said the Angelus, and announced that the fight would be resumed after dinner.

[9] "Esa misma tarde (Febrero 22) vinieron dos Indios trayentes al P. Antonio Jayme á casa de mi padre. Aunque los Indios lo tuvieron todo el dia en la mision, no se olvidaron de darle su alimento. Los sacerdotes quedaron viviendo en nuestra casa." Ord, "Ocurrencias."

little belongings, and retired to the hills where they pitched their camp.

When De la Guerra learned that the rebels had fled he sent ten soldiers to the mission. They found in the houses only a half-witted Indian besides four or five women, whom they kept imprisoned for two or three months. A little beyond the village near the threshing floor they met an Indian on a mule who was carrying away some wheat in a blanket. He begged them not to take him to the presidio as he feared they would kill him there. "Well, then," they replied, "we will kill you right here." With this they shot him dead.[10] After this glorious achievement they returned to the garrison. On the following day, Monday, De la Guerra sent another party. When they reached the inclosure they discovered four old Indians from the distant village of Dos Pueblos. These claimed they had heard that there was some trouble, and had come to learn the truth about it. Without mercy the ruffian soldiers shot them down. One of the poor men in his fright climbed an oak and exclaimed "Seuel," which in their language means, "I have done nothing." He was answered with a bullet. A few others without weapons, and one with only a bow and arrows to shoot squirrels, were unceremoniously shot dead for no other reason, says Fr. Ripoll, than that of running four steps and mounting a tree. "You can imagine, dear Father," he writes to Fr. Sarriá, "how I felt at hearing these deeds which before the comandante were described as great feats. On Tuesday another squad was sent with Ensign Maytorena. This man gave the soldiers leave to sack the houses of the Indians. They accordingly burst open the doors, broke open the boxes, and carried away the seeds, etc., and what they could not carry away they scattered on the road. Not satisfied with this feat, they entered the storehouse and my room and stole

[10] This shocking brutality shows how little even José de la Guerra's soldiers valued the life of an Indian. The whole affair is a blot on the garrison from the commander down. They could not have treated a dog or wild animal with less regard.

COLD-BLOODED MURDER OF AN INDIAN.

what pleased them, something the very Indians had not done." [11]

As soon as the report of the uprising reached Monterey, Governor Argüello despatched to Purisima one hundred and nine men, infantry, cavalry, and artillery with one four-pounder, under Lieutenant José Maria Estrada. The little army arrived there early Tuesday morning March 16th. Estrada immediately made preparations to surround the mission where four hundred Indians had fortified themselves. By eight o'clock the cannon had been placed in position opposite the main entrance. No sooner had the soldiers come within range than the Indians opened fire with muskets and the two one-pound pedreros, and at the same time sent forth a shower of arrows. Whilst the swivel guns attended by ignorant Indians did no harm, the soldiers with a few well-directed shots from the four-pounder shattered a part of the adobe walls. The Indians then tried to escape, but when they saw themselves cut off by the cavalry they begged



Signature of Fr. Antonio Rodríguez.

Fr. Antonio Rodríguez to intercede for them. He accordingly sent out a flag of truce and immediately followed it himself with an offer of surrender on the part of the frightened rebels. Thus after two hours and a half of fighting the battle was won. The soldiers had three men wounded, one of whom died, and the rebels suffered a loss of sixteen dead and many wounded. The booty consisted of the two pedreros, sixteen muskets, six cutlasses, a hundred and fifty lances, and a large number of bows and arrows.[12]

---

[11] Fr. Ripoll, "Levantamiento," May 5th, 1824, which is his report to Fr. Sarriá. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1599. Bancroft, vol. ii, 531, says it is among the best accounts of the affair.

[12] Estráda to Argüello, March 19th; Argüello to the Mexican Government, April 21st, 1824. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. i, 574-578.

De la Guerra, who with his troops from Santa Barbara had failed to arrive until after the affray, and Estrada under orders from the governor, now examined the prisoners. Seven of the Indians were condemned to death for complicity in the murder of Sepúlveda and his companions on February 21st. The sentence was executed on the 26th of March. All received the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Eucharist contritely before being shot, Fr. Rodríguez says in the mission records.[13] The four ring-leaders of the revolt, Mariáno, Pacómio, Benito, and Bernabé, were sentenced to ten years in the presidio and perpetual banishment from the province; eight others were punished with eight years' imprisonment at the presidio.[14]

In the meantime the fugitive neophytes of Santa Barbara with a few refugees from other missions, owing to the brutalities and vandalism committed by the Santa Barbara troops, retreated to the region of the Tulares. Fr. Ordáz of Santa Inés even reported that the rebels were at San Emígdio Rancho, where a Russian was instructing them in the use of firearms, and that the neophytes of San Buenaventura and San Gabriel showed alarming signs of discontent.[15] Argüello disregarded the warning; but De la Guerra despatched Lieutenant Fabregat with eighty men from Santa Barbara after the fugitives. Fr. Ripoll was invited to accompany the troops, but he declined on the ground that he did not want to appear before his Indian children with hostile soldiers. The soldiers encountered the rebels with whom some gentiles made common cause, and had a skirmish with them on April 9th at Buena Vista Lake. On April 11th a body of troops under Sergeant Carlos Carrillo had a fight at or near San Emígdio. Four Indians were killed and three of his company were wounded. Heavy winds and dust

---

[13] Libro de Entierros, Mission Purisima.

[14] Bancroft, ii, 532.

[15] Fr. Ordaz to Argüello, March 21st, 1824. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1597.

made operations difficult, wherefore Fabregat led his men back to Santa Barbara.[16]

Argüello then set to work organizing another expedition to bring back the neophytes. It was not that the Californians of those times cared much whether the Indians were saved spiritually or not, but indolent as they were they could not exist without the labor of the neophytes whom heretofore they had ill-treated and despised. Argüello was therefore determined to compel them to return. Fr. Sarriá, however, opposed this plan. He urged the governor in consideration of the brutalities perpetrated at Santa Barbara to grant a full pardon. This would bring them back. Force would only embitter them. Argüello granted the request on May 16th. Immediately the good Father sent two neophytes from Mission San Miguel with a kindly letter to the fugitives, urging them to avail themselves of the pardon, a copy of which he enclosed.[17]

The expedition, composed of sixty-three soldiers under command of Captain Pablo de la Portilla, nevertheless set out with one field-piece from Santa Barbara on June 2nd. They went by way of San Buenaventura up the Santa Clara River. At the same time fifty men from Monterey under Lieutenant Antonio del Valle with another cannon started out from San Miguel. The two divisions united on the 8th at San Emígdio, far out in the plain of the Tulares. Fr. Ripoll had again been requested to join the troops as chaplain, but he seems to have lost his wits through worry and excitement. In a letter of the 7th of May he declared he would rather die than be seen with soldiers "whom the Indians because of their narrow comprehension regard as enemies." They had seen the mayordomo of the mission with the troops before, and had at once blamed him and said: "Do you also come against us, after we served you so many years and supported you in the mission?" What would

[16] Fr. Ripoll, "Levantamiento," May 5th, 1824. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1599. Bancroft, ii, 533-534.

[17] Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, May 18th; June 28th, 1824. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1602; 1604.

they say if the priest appeared with the soldiers who came to punish or force them? [18]

Fr. Sarriá then determined to go in person, probably accompanied by the troops from San Miguel. Fr. Ripoll, after all, later came up with the troops from Santa Barbara. The fugitives were encamped at San Emígdio. They professed to be heartily repentant and willing to return, but they were afraid lest they be punished should they give up their weapons. "Only the high esteem," says Ósio, who in this instance may be believed, "in which the California inhabitants in general held the Rev. Fr. Vicente de Sarriá, and likewise



Signature of Fr. Antonio Ripoll.

the veneration of the Indians for him on account of his many virtues, dispelled their fear when he reassured them. The commander also assured the Indians all should be forgotten." [19] Thereupon the fugitives set out with the Fathers and troops on June 16th for Santa Barbara. The Indian Alcalde Andrés of Santa Barbara Mission was left behind to collect about forty refugees who had not yet been found. All at last reached the mission by the 21st of June, and thus the revolt of 1824 came to an end.[20]

Rafael González, a soldier of the expedition, relates the

---

[18] Fr. Ant. Ripoll to Fr. Sarriá, May 7th; Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, April 30th, 1824. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1600; 1709. "El Padre Ripoll amaba á sus neófitos como madre amorosa; su sentimiento fue tan grande que se enfermó, aunque no de gravedad." Ord, "Ocurrencias."

[19] Ant. M. Osio, "Historia," Mss., cap. iv, p. 85. "La estimacion que se hacia en general de los habitantes de California del R. P. Fr. Vicente de Sarriá, al mismo tiempo que lo veneraban por sus muchas virtudes, etc."

[20] Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, June 28th, 1824. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1604. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. i, 151-152.

interesting circumstance not mentioned by any one else, that the feast of Corpus Christi was celebrated in an enramada on the plain. This is probably correct, as the feast that year fell on the 17th of June, the day after the expedition began its return march. It must have contributed considerably to quiet the timid nature of the runaways, and the Fathers doubtless utilized the occasion accordingly.[21]

While the commotions described took place in California, changes occurred in Mexico which affected the missionaries as well as the military in California. On May 23rd, 1824, a new guardian was elected for San Fernando College in the person of Fr. Baldomero López to succeed Fr. José Gasol, who had been elected July 28th, 1821. On the 24th he with the discretos chose Fr. Vicente Francisco de Sarriá, who since the death of Fr. Señan had acted as presidente, to be comisario-prefecto.[22] The office had been vacant since the death of Fr. Payéras. So great was the confidence of the College in Fr. Sarriá that on the same occasion, instead of appointing a new presidente, it was resolved to leave the naming of the presidente to him, so that he might select a Father who would labor in harmony with him, though heretofore no disagreement had been noted between the two dignitaries. The Fr. Guardian therefore sent the required Patente and directed Fr. Sarriá to fill in the name of a Father, who in that case should be the lawful presidente.[23] The Fr. Comisario-Prefecto must have inscribed the name of Fr. Narciso Duran of Mission San José, for we find the latter notifying Governor Argüello of his appointment on April 2nd, 1825.[24] Fr. Sarriá had informed Argüello of his

---

[21] Bancroft, ii, 536.

[22] Fr. Miguel Lull, Presidente del Capitulo, to Fr. Vicente Sarriá, May 26th, 1824. Libro de Patentes, Mission Santa Barbara. Fr. López to Fr. Sarriá, June 2nd; December 15th, 1824. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[23] Fr. López to Fr. Sarriá, June 2nd, 1824. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[24] Fr. Durán to Argüello, April 2nd, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1731; "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. i, p. 84.

own election to the commissariat on November 11th, 1824.[25] Fr. Guardian López also communicated a new governmental regulation according to which the missionaries hereafter would have to pay postage, because the new authorities needed all the revenues they could secure in order to pay the troops and maintain themselves.[26]

Although the government paid slight attention to distant California, in 1825 a special Board, or *Junta de Fomento de las Californias,* was organized in Mexico to aid the President in taking proper measures for the benefit of California. It was composed of ten members, among whom Ex-Governor Solá is mentioned.[27] It was dissolved in 1827. While it existed, the members, who seemed to have been entirely ignorant of California affairs, wanted the Fr. Presidente of the missions to furnish reports, etc. Minister of Foreign and Internal Relations Lúcas Alaman[28] on June 25th, 1825, accordingly notified the Fr. Guardian that it was necessary to give the names of all the síndicos anywhere in Mexico, and to report on the management of the mission temporalities.

It is pleasant to note that Alaman still closes his communication after the old Christian fashion, "God keep you many years."[29] "After the change in the system of government," however, Alaman writes, "they endeavored to adopt the dating, style of address, and other usages after the manner introduced during the French Revolution. In giving the dates, besides the corresponding number of the Christian year, the custom was introduced of adding 'of the Independence,' 'of Liberty,' or 'of the Federation.' In place of 'Don' they would say 'Citizen.' For the polite and religious greeting 'God keep you many years,' with which official communica-

---

[25] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1611.

[26] Fr. López to Fr. Sarriá, December 15th, 1824. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[27] Fr. López to Fr. Sarriá, July 7th, 1824. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Bancroft, iii, 3.

[28] He is the author of the oft-mentioned "Historia de Mejico."

[29] "Dios le guarde muchos años!" Alaman to Fr. Guardian, June 20th, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1739.

tions usually closed, they substituted the Voltairian phrase 'God and Liberty!' [30] In the course of time the designation of the epochs was suppressed, the address 'citizen' soon became a term of ridicule, and the same is happening to the strange close given to written communications." [31] As yet, however, the government had not turned infidel. The first President, like Alaman himself, even revived somewhat the hopes that Mexico would in a slight measure at least be governed according to Christian principles, but the expectations were soon blasted, and have not been realized after nearly a century.

In reply to Minister Alamán's order the Fr. Guardian among other things reported "that the missions had but two síndicos in Mexico: one at Tepíc, Don Juan Bautista de Martiaréna, who was a deputy to the National Congress, the other at the capital, Don Estévan Vélez de Escalánte. Both were appointed by the College of San Fernando. These síndicos were empowered to defend the rights of the Indians and missions in court, though no case had thus far occurred. The síndico at Tepíc was only employed in receiving the produce which the missions sent for sale, and with the proceeds he purchased the articles which the missionaries indicated without the interference of the Fr. Procurator at the College. He thus simply acted as commission merchant for the missionary establishments. The síndico at the capital only received the sínodos or annual allowances from the Pious Fund for the missionaries, and the money obtained from the national treasury for the drafts sent from California. With the sínodos the Fr. Procurator purchased the

---

[30] "Dios y Libertad!" Alaman here relates the origin of the phrase. "Whilst Voltaire," he says, "among his followers held a kind of philosophical patriarchate, Prince Poniatowski, the son of the King of Poland, was one day introduced to him. Voltaire saluted him, and placing his hands on the youth's head, he said 'Dieu et la Liberte.' This is the not very commendable origin of our official phrase." Alaman, "Historia de Mejico," tom. v, lib. ii, cap. xi, 813.

[31] Alaman, loco citato.

goods which the missionaries desired for themselves and their churches. Since 1810 the payment of the sínodos from the Pious Fund had ceased, and therefore the purchase of the goods for the Fathers had also stopped. The last invoice was procured in 1810. This remained packed up, owing to the war, until 1815, when a part of the goods was sent by way of Acapulco. The remainder it was not possible to forward until 1824 by way of San Blas.

"The sínodos or annual stipends, at the rate of $400 for each missionary, which remain unpaid down to September 30th, 1824, amount to $153,712 and seven reales. The drafts remaining unpaid for cattle, grain, and other produce furnished the troops at great hardship to the mission Indians, amount to $259,151,[32] and eight and one-half granos. The correctness of these drafts are sworn to with the approval of the governor by the habilitados at the respective presidios. They are due for payment by the National Treasury. The goods were furnished to the governor and his soldiers. In order that the soldiers might not suffer for want of food, the missionaries were compelled to prefer them to their poor neophytes lest the troops rebel for lack of provisions.[33] We can therefore truly say that the missions alone, or the toil of the unhappy neophytes, have supported the troops since 1810. In consequence the Indians complain bitterly for having to work hard in order that the soldiers might eat, and for receiving no pay for their toil and their pains which is all represented by the drafts unpaid since 1810.

"The dissatisfaction, notwithstanding the many means and devices employed by the friars to mitigate the hardships of the Indians, resulted in the revolt of last year." After briefly recounting what we already know on this point, and how by means of sweetness and mildness the Fathers succeeded in

---

[32] Governor Solá had already reported to the viceroy that the drafts amounted to more than $400,000.

[33] On the other hand it was to be feared that the Indians would rebel, as they did, so that the poor missionaries stood between two fires.

bringing back the insurgents, the Fr. Guardian warns the Minister "that such attempts to shake off the unbearable yoke may be repeated, because what the soldiers consume must be produced by the Indians. The colonists, unfortunately, are too indolent to work, so that as a rule the troops will have nothing to eat unless the Indians prepare it for them."

"The revolt was not against the missionaries, but against the military who forced them to work without compensation. In addition, the discontent was increased by extraordinary contributions which the territorial assembly levied upon the missions, which means the Indians, and demanded in cash, whereas everybody else might pay in kind. Thus the unfortunate neophytes are harassed in every way, and no recourse is open to them save through the College. Hence they petition through me," the Fr. Guardian closes his pathetic appeal, "for the help from the Illustrious President of the Federation, and they beseech Your Excellency, with the most profound submission, that you deign to bring this explanation and petition to the consideration of the President, in order that he turn his compassionate heart towards those poor Indians by giving orders that at least some of the aforesaid drafts may be paid, so that the neophytes may be relieved by means of some of the articles which they need most. . . . I think I have presented the matter sufficiently clear, but declare that neither the síndicos nor the Fr. Procurator, nor I have had anything to do with the management of the temporalities, as this pertains exclusively to the missionaries, and to each one in particular for his respective mission." [34]

The thoughtful reader will have observed that all the official correspondence of the Fathers in both Mexico and Cali-

---

[34] Fr. Bald. López to Minister Alamán, July 7th, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1739. Bancroft, ii, 518, in this connection speaks of Fr. Guardian Cortés. Fr. Juan Cortés never was guardian of San Fernando College, but only procurator for the California missions.

fornia, even under the most provoking circumstances, evinces a spirit of politeness, cordiality, charity, moderation, and sincerity. Withal these documents give evidence of no mean degree of learning and ability.

CHAPTER XIII.

New Mexican Constitution.—Oath Demanded.—Fr. Sarriá Refuses.—The Legislators Meet.—They Take the Oath.—Fr. Esténaga's Action.—Proposition of the Legislators.—Argüello's Decision.—Fr. Sarriá Justifies His Refusal to Fr. Durán and Argüello.—Fr. Tápis to Fr. Durán.—Action of the Mexican President Concerning Fr. Sarriá.—Fr. Durán Changes His Mind.—Demands for Supplies Continue.—Fr. Durán Angers Comandante Martínez.—Fr. Viader Unterrified.—Arrival of Governor Echeandía.—Wants to Reform Things.—His Absurd Report.—Fr. Arroyo to Herrera.—Numerous Baptisms.—Correspondence of Fr. Ibárra with De la Guerra and Carrillo.—Situation at Mission San Fernando.

A NEW system of government in Mexico naturally called for a new constitution. This the Mexican Congress adopted and promulgated on October 4th, 1824. It provided for a republican form of government similar to that of the United States. Under its regulations Guadalupe Victoria was chosen president and assumed the office on October 10th.[1] The provisional executive power on October 4th also decreed as follows: "The individual or individuals comprehended in the articles of this decree who in any manner shall refuse to take the prescribed oath on the constitution, will be banished from the territory of the republic, if, after they have been once called upon by the government or corresponding authority, they shall persist in their determination."[2] On October 6th Victoria directed that in the provinces the oath should be taken within nine days after the reception and publication of the Constitution and accompanying decrees.[3]

[1] Alaman, "Historia de Mejico," tom. v, lib. ii, cap. xi, p. 811.

[2] "El individuo ó individuos comprendidos en los artículos de este decreto, que de alguna manera se resistieren á prestar el juramento prevenido, seran estrañados del territorio de la república, si requeridos una vez por el gobierno, ó autoridad correspondiente, permanecieren en su proposito." Art. 12. "Decreto del Supremo Poder Ejecutivo." "Sta. Barb Arch."

[3] Art. 4. Bando del Pres. Victoria. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

Governor Argüello received the documents early in February 1825. He at once summoned the legislative assembly to meet at Monterey, and at the same time notified Fr. Sarriá that he was expected to comply with the provisions regarding the oath of allegiance on Sunday February 13th. After consulting with Fr. Estévan Tápis at San Juan Bautista, the Fr. Prefect on February 11th replied: "Having reflected on the oath which is demanded of us, I have concluded that I cannot take it without violating prior obligations of justice and fidelity. I therefore inform you accordingly, albeit with much and earnest regret, inasmuch as in all things possible I should wish to give an example of submission as I have done heretofore; yet I am now unable, because my conscience forbids. For the same reason I will not influence the other Fathers to take said oath, or to sanction it by celebrating holy Mass and singing the Te Deum as is ordered in your communication of the 3rd instant. I am aware that we are threatened with exile, but I will undergo all, along with the crushing sorrow and many tears which the abandonment of the much beloved flock entrusted to my care will cause me, and will bear it for God's sake. I will leave whenever it must be for the sake of the same God, whom I have more than once implored to make me suffer whatever is useful for His Holy and Adorable Name." [4] Though he would not direct the Fathers to swear allegiance, Fr. Sarriá writes to Argüello on March 30th, "I assure you that as far as my subjects are concerned I have left them entirely at liberty to do in this particular what they may judge proper before God; nor did I in the circular to them give the motives of my refusal." [5]

---

[4] Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, February 11th, 1825. "Archb. Arch," no. 1724.

[5] "Asegurandole por lo que toca á mis súbditos los he dejado en entera libertad para hacer en el particular lo que juzgaren según Dios, como se lo advertí a todos, ni aun les expresé en la circular que dirigí las causas motivas de mi renuncia." Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, March 30th, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," no.

Owing to heavy rains and swollen streams the southern delegates to the assembly could not arrive in time; but on Saturday March 26th two-thirds of the diputacion responded to the call of their names, that is to say Governor Argüello, Francisco Castro, Carlos Castro, Antonio Castro, José Castro, and the secretary, José J. de la Torre. The Constitution was ratified, and then sworn to by Governor Argüello, and the members of the assembly. The document was then read to the officers, soldiers, and settlers, who all took the oath at the foot of the flag in the garrison. Thus the new order of things was inaugurated with triple salutes from the artillery, and amid shouts and the ringing of bells for three days. "Only the Solemn Mass and the Te Deum was wanting," Secretary Torre remarks in the minutes of the session, "because the Rev. Fr. Prefecto, Fr. Vicente Francisco de Sarriá, would not take the oath, much less call upon his subjects to do so." [6]

At San Francisco, however, as reported by Comandante Ignacio Martínez, "on Sunday April 24th, 1825, after the decree had been read, the oath was taken. The soldiers were ordered to present arms, and in a loud voice the Constitution was cheered three times, and each time accompanied



Signature of Fr. Thomas Esténaga.

by a discharge of artillery. When this last act was finished all marched to the chapel of this presidio where the Rev. Fr. Tomas Esténaga, missionary of the adjoining mission, sang the High Mass and delivered an excellent discourse in keeping with the circumstances. During the holy Mass artil-

1725. José M. Estudillo on July 7th to Argüello corroborated the statement that the Fathers by circular were left free. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1821.

[6] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 64-65.

lery salutes were fired. At the close of the Mass a solemn Te Deum was intoned."[7] At San Diego, on the other hand, the missionaries refused to participate in the ratification and swearing of allegiance.[8] What took place at Santa Barbara, where José de la Guerra was in command of the presidio, is not on record.

On April 7th, 1825, the two Castros, Francisco and Carlos, and the substitutes Antonio and José Castro with Governor Argüello assembled in extraordinary session for the purpose of discussing the refusal of Comisario-Prefecto Fr. Sarriá to take the oath. Francisco Castro "set forth the necessity of ascertaining whether all the missionaries of the province agreed with their prelate Fr. Francisco de Sarriá regarding the oath on the Constitution of the United States of Mexico; that it was for the welfare of the province that those who were of this opinion should be entirely relieved of the management of the property belonging to the neophytes of the missions, and be restricted to the spiritual care; and that for the management of said property of said neophytes an upright individual should be designated for their administration.[9] Carlos and José Castro agreed with the speaker; but, after a long discussion, the honorable presiding officer, Argüello, spoke on the motion at some length. He was of the opinion that on no account was it expedient to take away the temporalities from the religious who managed them, because in the first place all would depart and leave their beloved flock without the spiritual food; and in the second place because in the province it would be very difficult to find a person who could discharge the duty of managing the prop-

[7] "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xiv, p. 688. On September 2nd Minister Llave directed the governor to express the great satisfaction of the government at this patriotic action of Fr. Esténaga. Bancroft, iii, 19.

[8] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap. iii, 353-355.

[9] It seems very clear that this proposition was not made without a good measure of self-interest. The property of the Indians, now guarded by the friars, became the bone of contention early.

erty.[10] Many other reasons were set forth by the governor which it would be too tedious to relate.

"Francisco Castro again rose to speak on the subject. He held that in order to insure the property of the missions, in case his proposition were not practicable, another plan should be devised, unless the governor intended to be responsible for the bad results that might follow. The governor replied that he was ready to be responsible, because it was morally impossible to accede to the proposition on account of the many difficulties that would arise as he had explained. Antonio Castro declared that the plans as set forth by his companions appeared to him good; but that if the consequences would entail damage to the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Religion, he would not in any way support their views, because their information on the subject was necessarily meagre."[11] With this the session closed, but Argüello reported to the President of Mexico for instructions.

In a long letter covering twenty-four pages, abounding in learned citations and reasoning, and addressed to Fr. Presidente Durán, Fr. Sarriá explained and justified his attitude with regard to the oath of allegiance. He objected to it on the following grounds:—1. Previous obligation to the King of Spain until the latter acknowledged the independence of Mexico and released them of their fealty.—2. The new Constitution required him to take up arms against the King of Spain if he should appear at the head of an army in the province which in justice is his.—3. "It is true that I have already sworn to the independence of Mexico; but Spain was then not under legitimate government, the king was deprived of his liberty, and Religion was threatened. On the other hand according to the 'Plan de Iguala' Fernando VII. or

---

[10] This must have acted like a cold shower bath on the aspirations to confiscate the mission property. Argüello was not entirely gone; besides, he knew the men who made the proposition.

[11] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Records i, 67-68. We have reproduced the minutes of this remarkable session in order to expose the true spirit of the Castros and other Californians who are about to exhibit themselves.

one of his heirs was to occupy the throne of Mexico with some chance of approval from Spain. After all, that oath was ordered by the Bishop of the Diocese and after the majority of the missionaries, and especially the Fr. Prefecto, had voted to take it."—4. *Fear that the new Mexican Republic was only a duplicate of the French Revolution, inasmuch as it began like the French insurrection by expelling the religious, and deposing and killing its ruler.*[12] Fr. Sarriá went on to enumerate the atrocities of the French republic where Mirabeau had publicly declared that, in order to establish a commonwealth, it was necessary to remove from their midst the Catholic Religion, and that it was therefore proscribed.—5. In any case, *Religion took no sides,* and therefore its ministers should be left out of the wranglings; for though she does not favor rebellions, *she maintains herself under any form of government compatible with justice and the happiness of the people.*[13] She is content to create no disturbance or internal strifes, and does not resist the established authorities, but shows fidelity in everything that is not contrary to the Gospel and holy Religion. Thus she has continued even under the rule of the Turks, Saracens, Chinese, etc. Her children observed the civil obligations, but would not swear to peculiar constitutions which like the Koran were mixed with infidelity and superstitions. "I have not the courage to take more oaths, not out of discontent with the independence, nor for any other disagreeable motive, but because I am of the opinion that oaths have become mere playthings." [14]

Addressing Governor Argüello in a similar strain, Fr. Sarriá closes with these words which would have been satis-

---

[12] Iturbide, who was the real liberator of Mexico.

[13] "Aunque jamas esta Religion Catolica favoreció la rebeldia, sabe con todo mantenerse firme á pesar de todas variaciones de los estados, y bajo toda suerte de gobiernos compatibles con la justicia y felicidad de los pueblos."

[14] Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Durán, April 23rd, 1825. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Fr. Durán seems to have favored taking the oath. Others were likewise willing.

factory to any government controlled by reason: "I offer to take the oath of fidelity of not doing anything against the established government. If this is not admitted, I say to you that I am resigned to the penalty of exile imposed. I also inform you that, as far as my subjects are concerned, I have left them entirely free to take the required oath or to refuse it. I am not ignorant of the punishment of exile which I incur by my refusal, which is based upon the higher motives already stated. Yet I cannot trample under foot the dictates of my conscience, neither on account of that penalty nor on account of more grievous ones which may be inflicted upon me, among which is not the least for me that I must fail in my constant obedience and submission which in everything else I have shown and now show to the government, and to be forced, as I fear, to abandon this tender Christianity and numerous helpless flock, and to let it go without the shepherds, exposed to utter dispersion and ruin. I bewail all this at the mission of my heart and recommend it to God. San Carlos, April 14th, 1825." [15]

The friars were by no means unanimous as to what action should be taken by each and all. Had they been called upon to choose merely between the King of Spain or the monarchy and the republic, it is very certain that they would have found little difficulty to take the oath of allegiance. In this case, however, the French Republic loomed up in the background with all its atrocities, as Fr. Sarriá recalled them, and they shuddered lest they become a party to such infernal irreligion. Thus far the Mexican Government had not committed itself absolutely, but the Fathers had good reason to believe that the republic, such as it was, leaned more towards Voltairianism than towards Christianity. The persecution of the religious at the very beginning convinced them in what direction the political wind blew. This general feeling is well expressed in a letter, which Fr. Estévan Tápis, who next to Fr. Sarriá was held in veneration for his learning and solid piety, addressed to Fr. Durán.

[15] Fr. Sarriá to Argüello, April 14th, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1726.

"I assure Your Reverence," he writes to Fr. Presidente Durán, "that I am most content to be able to rest quietly, notwithstanding the strong contrary winds of opinion between the two columns of these missions [16] with regard to the oath on the Mexican Constitution. If, however, the necessity should arise of having to follow one of the opposing guides, which one would I follow? The Rev. Fr. Prefecto.[17] This has always been my intention, because in following this road no thorns will be found, which would certainly perforate my conscience if I took the oath. I am more decided now, after reading the interesting letter which Fr. Abella has communicated,[18] and which Your Reverence will read. I am ready to embark, even though it be on a vessel without sails or rudder.[19] In this case I shall take as patrons the two holy sisters,[20] with St. Marcella, and St. Maximin, for a safe voyage whithersoever God wills. What happiness it would be for me, if I deserved to suffer a little or much for not wanting to adore the *Beast,* or its forerunner, False Philosophy! [21] I am not competent to instruct Your Rever-

---

[16] That is to say, the Fr. Prefecto Vicente de Sarriá and the Fr. Presidente Narciso Durán who differed on the subject of the oath.

[17] Fr. Durán thus learned that in this matter he could not count on Fr. Tápis who had been presidente himself during three terms. Fr. Durán had just entered on the first term.

[18] Fr. Ramón Abella was stationed at San Carlos and attended Monterey presidio, the headquarters of the new politicians. He therefore understood the animus of the Mexican Government through the territorial representatives.

[19] This certainly does not show that the friars were anxious to hold on to the mission property or to the power it gave them, as Bancroft, Hittell, and the young Californians asserted. The friars had no personal interest in the temporalities; hence they could leave them without a pang.

[20] St. Mary Magdalene and St. Martha whom with the other two mentioned the Jews are said to have put on a ship without sail or rudder in order to destroy them, but who safely landed in France.

[21] "La Bestia, ó su precusora, la falsa Filosofia." The infidels and persecutors of the Church in France loved to pose as

ence on this point, nor on others. I only say that I should rejoice exceedingly if you and all the brethren were of my opinion, provided you could come to that conclusion in conscience. I live in the confidence of not erring when I follow the judgment of my prelate [22] by whose mouth, it seems, I hear the voice of God. Let us recommend this matter to the Lord, and He will sustain us." [23] Two weeks later Fr. Tápis sighed: "Every day moral blows of grief and perturbation are received. Everything quickens my desire of going to San Marzal,[24] or rather to heaven whither the malice of the beast reaches not." [25] His desire was gratified. After a lingering and painful disease good Fr. Tápis died at Mission San Juan Bautista on November 3rd, only six months later.[26]

In the meantime the report of Fr. Sarriá's refusal to take the oath had reached Mexico. In June an order of President Victoria was despatched to California for the arrest of the recalcitrant Fr. Prefecto and for his transportation to Mexico on the first ship. Instructions were also given to treat the person and character of the venerable prisoner

---

philosophers. In Mexico they call themselves Científicos. Both are misnomers. True philosophy never stops short of the ultimate cause of all things. Hence it can never be a godless science. It implies the application of reason and thorough investigation. No one who studies the history of these men will concede that they were guided by reason. Unreasoning passion and infernal hatred for God and everything that reminds of Him are the evident motives of such "philosophers and scientists." This makes it clear why the Fathers refused to swear allegiance to the Mexican Republic. They feared that it was reared in the interest of Voltairianism, the embodiment of everything anti-Christian. The history of Mexico demonstrates that their judgment was quite correct.

[22] Fr. Durán was the immediate prelate; above him stood Fr. Sarriá.

[23] Fr. Tápis to Fr. Durán, April 29th, 1825. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[24] San Marzal, metaphorical for "death," a Spanish saying.

[25] Fr. Tápis to Fr. Durán, May 9th, 1825. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[26] Libro de Entierros, Mission San Juan Bautista.

with due respect.[27] The first part of the order was carried out in October, but the arrest at Monterey seems to have been only nominal. It may be that he was forbidden to officiate in public, for his name does not appear in the mission register of San Carlos for about a year, but he suffered no interference with his personal liberty; for on March 21st, 1826, we find him writing to Fr. Durán from Mission San Antonio.[28]

The treatment of his prelate, and an order of José M. de Echeandía, the new governor,[29] to leave his mission of San José and to come all the way down to San Diego, about six hundred miles, merely to take the oath of allegiance, opened the eyes of Fr. Durán, if perchance he had still any doubts as to the character of the men who constituted themselves the Mexican Republic. His reply to Echeandia's inconsiderate demand was dignified and to the point. The letter is not extant, but its tenor may be inferred from another communication addressed to J. M. Herrera,[30] who had preceded the new governor and held the office of commissary. "I inform you," he wrote under date of October 12th, a few days after Fr. Sarriá's arrest, "that the governor by letter of October 3rd directs me to proceed to San Diego for the purpose of taking the oath on the Constitution. I reply to His Honor that I am alone at this mission and cannot leave it without a priest; and, moreover, being tired of so many oaths, I am not inclined to take more oaths, *not from disaffection for the independence,* nor for any other odious passion, for I am of the political opinion that independence

---

[27] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap. iii, 472.

[28] "Santa Barbara Archives."

[29] He had been appointed February 1st, 1825, and was then on his way from Loreto to San Diego. See vol. i, this work, pt. iv, cap. ix.

[30] He was appointed February 1st, 1825, and sent to California as comisario to take charge of the territorial finances. The habilitados at the four presidios thereafter served as his subordinates for collecting the revenues, so that locally there was no change. Hittell, ii, 107; Bancroft, ii, 607; 614.

is of more benefit to Spain than to America, but because it seems that oaths have become playthings.[31] I offer to swear an oath of fidelity to do nothing against the established government. If this be not accepted, I tell you that I am resigned to the penalty of banishment imposed by the Constitution. From this you can infer how I feel at present; and bearing in mind the severity which has been displayed towards the Rev. Fr. Prefecto, must I make myself ready or not to go the same road?" [32] Echeandía after that thought it wise to let the resolute friars alone for a time.

The demand for supplies meanwhile continued. The Fathers were sometimes at their wits' end in their efforts to comply without depriving the neophytes of the most necessary articles of food and clothing; yet the military would not exert themselves to ease the burden of the Indians and their spiritual guides. They seemed to hold that the missions existed merely for the benefit of the idle troops and territorial officials, whereas according to the intention of Spain the reverse was true. The burden could have been more easily borne if the soldiers had made any effort by exemplary conduct and interest for the progress of the Indians to be of use to the missions. In that case, however, they would not have been absolutely idle; they would have supported themselves to some extent. It would have been better, as there was no need of so many, to discharge most of them and assign them some land which they might cultivate. Fr. Durán, indeed, on one occasion told Comandante Ignacio Martínez of San Francisco that he could send no supplies, and that it would be best to discharge the soldiers if there was lack of rations.[33] That would have been a wise move and a blessing for the Indians and friars, at any rate, for there was no more need of military protection for the Fathers, least of all for such "protection." The insinuation angered

[31] "sino porque los juramentos parece se han vuelto cosa de juguete."

[32] Fr. Durán to Herrera, October 12th, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1740.

[33] Bancroft, iii, 20.

Martínez, and he asked the governor for permission to take the supplies by force; but Fr. Viader of Santa Clara could not be terrified that way any more than his neighbor of Mission San José. He wrote that his mission had to buy wheat for its neophytes, whilst the pueblo of San José had plenty of grain to sell to the presidios. "The moment the keys are taken from us by force," he declared, "we will not take them back, nor attend to the temporal administration." At San Diego, too, the soldiers continued destitute because of their abject indolence, and because the new Mexican government failed to pay them, so that they with their families simply made the usual demands upon the mission. The commander was honest enough to acknowledge, what was evident, that the Fathers gave all they could.[34]

The new governor was not touched by such sacrifices. Echeandía came to Upper California with hostility for the religious habit, and he was determined to relegate it to the interior of the church and house as soon as practicable, that is to say, he intended to remove the friars from the administration of the temporalities of the neophytes. Meanwhile he resolved to make the religious feel his superiority. After Argüello in October 1825 had delivered the reins of government to the governor at San Diego, and had resumed his former position of comandante of the presidio on San Francisco Bay, Echeandía set to work "reforming" things in the territory. One of his earliest acts, which showed his animus, was to forbid the missionaries to trade with any vessel outside the four presidio ports. Governor Solá had permitted them to exchange produce for goods near their missions, and to pay the duties at the presidios. Now the missions had to forego this convenience. For instance, Mission San Luis Obispo was obliged to transport its produce on the backs of mules at great expense to distant Monterey or Santa Barbara, and likewise make its purchases there.[35] Two weeks later he issued a proclamation requiring all, the

[34] Bancroft, iii, 20.

[35] Echeandia, "Prohibicion de todo comércio, etc.," December 15th, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1815.

missions included, to pay ten per cent. tax of their income for the benefit of the "well-deserving troops who conserve the peace of the territory." [36]

This, it must be remembered, was in addition to the forced contributions which the missions alone were called upon to make time and again. The Fathers in the name of their neophytes would not have complained of paying taxes like others, if that was all that was demanded; but such was not the case. For instance, in the following June Fr. Durán found himself compelled to protest against furnishing ten per cent. of the newly-branded cattle for the national rancho, because a much larger percentage had already been delivered during the year.[37] Echeandía writing to the Minister of War on April 26th, 1826, justified his order with regard to the missions on the ground that he was informed that some of them had from $70,000 to $100,000 in their coffers.[38] It may be safely asserted that there was not so much money in the whole territory at said period. Yet such extravagant charges against the missions were freely circulated among the indolent populace and readily believed, because the missionaries, owing to their thrift, economy, and abstemiousness, somehow always managed to meet most of the exorbitant demands from the relentless and useless military. It was actually believed that the friars secretly possessed great treasures and even gold mines. The stupid tale has not yet died out among the Californians.

In reality the missions were already in a sad plight, so much so that all the Fathers longed for the day that would relieve them of the burden which was so uncongenial to their tastes and vocation. Thus Fr. Felipe Arroyo wrote to Herrera from San Juan Bautista: "I see your application for supplies of all kinds for the troops. Some of the articles are not on hand. There are difficulties all around, and

[36] Echeandía, "Bando," January 1st, 1826. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1942. Renewed in an order to Herrera, August 25th, September 6th, 1827. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1943.

[37] Bancroft, iii, 88.

[38] Bancroft, iii, 88. See Appendix F.

I am overburdened with cares which render life wearisome. There is hardly anything of the religious in me, and I scarcely know what to do in these troublous times. I made the vows of a Friar Minor; instead, I must manage temporalities, sow grain, raise sheep, horses, and cows, preach,



Signature of Fr. Felipe Arroyo de la Cuesta.

baptize, bury the dead, visit the sick, direct carts, haul stones, lime, etc. These things are as disagreeable as thorns, bitter, hard, unbearable, and they rob me of time, tranquillity, and health of both soul and body. I desire with lively anxiety to devote myself to my sacred calling and to serve the Lord."[39] We can well appreciate the poor Father's predicament when we bear in mind that since Fr. Tápis's death he stood alone with 1200 neophytes, and with no hope of obtaining either an assistant or a substitute. We may fancy that the spiritual condition of the people must have suffered in consequence of the burden of having to look after the temporal affairs of so many souls. Yet all through the decade a great many gentiles from eastern rancherias joined the mission. Fr. Arroyo frequently baptized from twenty to thirty converts in one day.[40] This involved much spiritual work of which only a missionary can form any conception, and every additional convert meant another mouth to fill and a body to clothe with no other income than what the land produced under the supervision of the missionary. Notwithstanding that he had to provide for such a large family, Fr. Arroyo like the other missionaries was called upon to pay ten per

[39] Fr. Arroyo de la Cuesta to Herrera, August 10th, 1826. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1853.

[40] Libro de Bautismos, Mission San Juan Bautista.

cent. of the proceeds, six per cent. of what he sold to shippers, and respond to the incessant calls for supplies.

From Mission San Fernando we have another tale of woe, which pictures the situation at all the missionary establishments. Comandante De la Guerra of Santa Barbara presidio tried to prove that the furnishing of supplies was not a favor to the troops, but an ordinary duty, and that it must continue until the *memorias* should come from Mexico with a band of missionaries. Fr. Ibárra was not a simpleton; like the other missionaries, when it came to arguments, he stood on solid ground and could hold his own. "If you do not eat till then," he replied, "I assure you that you will have decidedly elastic stomachs; and as to missionaries coming here, I will believe it when I see them." [41] A sharp correspondence ensued on account of the demands and the worthless character of the guards, notably of one Cota, the corporal of the guard. We give portions of the letters, as they not only reveal some of the grievances with which all the Fathers had to contend, but further explain how it was that so many and incessant orders for food, clothing, etc., harrassed the missions.

"In the month of March," he writes as early as April 14th, 1821, "the soldiers took away fifty-two arrobas [42] of mantéca. They divided this amount among thirteen men, so that each one received a hundred pounds. Ask yourself whether in Spain a whole army would cause so much expense in this particular matter. At this rate, can the missionaries ever come out of want? I will be grateful to you if you send me a list which tells me what rations I must furnish. The same I ask with regard to shoes. Shoemakers must continually be kept at work if we have to satisfy the soldiers. They claimed the material is not good. I replied that if they had to pay for them, the shoes would last at least

[41] "Como Uds. no coman hasta entonces, yo le aseguro que tendran las barrigas bastante elásticas." June 29th, 1825. "De la Guerra Collection."

[42] As an arroba was equal to 25 lbs., they did away with 1300 lbs.!

three months; but as they pay nothing, it matters nothing to them to demand them every day. The same is true with regard to mantéca. I am not saying this through peevishness, much less to reproach, but because I hold, and it is a fact, that a steward cannot dispose at will of the property which he manages, as he is not the owner or master.[43] Moreover, one of the sins that cry to heaven for vengeance is the oppression of the poor, orphans and widows. This does not mean that I am unwilling to contribute to the support of the military, but, as far as lies in me, I am not willing to be bound to suffer in the next life for the damage which through my negligence may result to these unfortunate orphans, inasmuch as I find myself bound to act as a father and pastor. . . . I do not see that even by driving them like slaves is it possible to meet the demands. It is the cause of no little grief not to be able to treat them differently on account of such demands." [44] "The Indian," Fr. Ibárra writes on July 26th, 1821, "has nothing more than a blanket and a pair of pants. It seems to me, therefore, that wanting to prevent such evils and damage is not passion, but good sense." [45]

---

[43] The friars thus one and all regarded themselves as mere stewards or guardians of the Indians who had so far proved themselves incapable of managing their property.

[44] "pues, veo ni aun tratandoles como esclavos es posible trabajar para tantos gastos; y no me es poco desconsuelo no poderlos tratar de otra manera." Fr. Ibárra to De la Guerra, April 14th, 1821. "De la Guerra Collection."

[45] "Pues me parece, que el querer impedir estos malos y perjuicios no ser pasion, sino razon." Fr. Ibarra to De la Guerra. "De la Guerra Collection."

CHAPTER XIV.

Fr. Ibarra's Plain Language Concerning the Soldiers.—Indignant Fr. Martínez Takes Steps to Protect Himself.—Hittell's Misrepresentation.—Alvarado's Silly Story.—Fr. Martinez Caustic.—Intolerable Conditions.—Fr. Peiri Disgusted.—Echeandía Equalizes Mission Taxes.—His Sentiments Regarding the Missionaries.—Missions Mulcted.—Cause of Military Destitution.—Oath of Allegiance.—Mission Lands Coveted.—Echeandía Emancipates Some Indians.—Results.—Missions Decay.—Echeandía Orders Schools Opened.

HAVING to maintain the whole government and the military of California almost alone was bad enough, but this was not the worst grievance of the missionaries. Fr. Ibárra more fully than other Fathers reveals this phase of missionary troubles. We therefore let him speak in order to secure a good view of this period. "That we should serve and respect him who is of benefit," he writes, "is very proper and just; but that we should feed him who not only not protects us but utterly destroys, to bear this a stout heart is needed. In truth, what benefit does this mission receive or has it received from the Santa Barbara Presidio? None; but what damage has it suffered? Incalculable damage. Indeed, were it not for the presidio, I could figure on my labor and toil. I would not then mind the Tulares or Sierras, the refuge of wicked men. The second sierra or bawdry is the presidio, which annoys us most. If a low man should behave in a low manner, one need not be surprised; but that men who think themselves to be honorable, should act thus, this is what stuns."[1] In the same letter to Carrillo Fr. Ibárra declared that the soldiers should go to work, raise grain, and not live on the toil of the Indians

[1] "porque el que un hombre bajo obre bajeras no es de maravillar; pero el que los hombres que se tienen por honor las executen es lo que pasma." Fr. Ibárra to Carlos Carrillo, April 11th, 1825. "De la Guerra Collection."

whom they robbed and deceived with their talk about liberty, while in reality they treated them like slaves. This, instead of relief, brought out a sharp reply from De la Guerra, who warned the intrepid friar that he might suffer from such criticism.[2]

"Every demand for contributions," Fr. Ibárra continues nevertheless, "implies a contract between both parties, so that if one fails the other is obliged to nothing. Now, consider what your presidio has contributed to the welfare of this mission since I am here, and you will be able to infer that this mission is under no obligation to your presidio. The government, you say, demands aid for the presidio from the pueblo and mission. This is a sacred duty, as you call it. Well, from this obligation of the mission to support the presidio follows the duty of the presidio to aid the mission so that it can advance spiritually and temporally; but the very opposite obtains, so much so that the mission is now in a worse condition than at the beginning, because at that time troops would follow runaway Indians and bring them back. The soldiers do this no more, nor do they allow it; but with the greater apparent liberty, and the better opportunities for gratifying themselves at the presidio or in the mountains, the Indians go away whenever they please, so that we have come to such a pass that we have not the men to do the necessary work at the mission. The holy virtue of justice, I thought, consisted in punishing the guilty and rewarding the innocent; I see that such is not the case, but that it consists in self-interest and in harassing the innocent the more." [3]

Fr. Ibárra on another occasion declared that, "though the troops here are few, if it were in my power, I would take them to Simí,[4] nay, even a little farther, perhaps to Monterey. I am tired of telling them in vain that there is

[2] Bancroft, ii, 570.

[3] Fr. Ibárra to De la Guerra, May 2nd, 1825. "De la Guerra Collection."

[4] Simí, was a ranch west of San Fernando in what is now Ventura County. He would put them to work far away.

a law which forbids them to have intercourse with the neophytes, and hence that they are not permitted to enter the rancheria or the shops. On the 5th of this month I was notified that a soldier was in the smithy. Many of the Indians have nice handkerchiefs and pretty shirts. The soldiers give them to drink.—I refrain from telling you more of what I should tell in person. The soldiers also let the Indians have horses, and let them do just as they please. I see no difference between these guards and hostile warriors save the different names. The French in Spain used to say: 'All is ours.' Here they say: 'All must be given to us.' Among them is one Cordéro.[5] A more appropriate name would be wolf or cat. I presume that the alférez has told you all about him. Cota came down here with much arrogance. . . . These and similar insults one continually receives from these soldiers. To make matters worse, worms



Signature of Fr. Francisco Gonzalez de Ibárra.

have about destroyed our horse-beans; and the locusts have consumed our beans so that from seven fanegas sown there is not as much as a shoot that tells what was on the land. Of seven fanegas of corn we received nothing. This enemy has gone away from the land, but he usually returns. Nevertheless, I hope in God that food will not fail us."[6]

Fr. Luis Martínez of San Luis Obispo also suffered from the rude and overbearing guards; but unlike the missionaries generally, he had recourse to drastic measures when he saw that it was useless to appeal to higher officials. The latter probably rarely found better substitutes; but for the sake of the neophytes the arrogance had to be stopped, lest the

[5] Cordero means lamb. Guillermo Cota was the corporal.

[6] Fr. Ibárra to De la Guerra, July 11th, 1821. "De la Guerra Collection."

unsophisticated natives think that the priest was subject to every petty military in matters of mission management. What he did, Fr. Martínez fearlessly reported to Governor L. Argüello. "The insults," he wrote, "which this officer and the soldiers on two occasions heaped upon me, when he not only insulted me in words, but moved against me with disgusting gestures and set the guards upon me, have compelled me to close the doors of the holy church upon them, in order to make them understand what a priest is and what respect and attention is due to him." [7]

Ignorance, if nothing worse, makes Hittell speak of this occurrence as a "specimen of missionary excommunication," as though that punishment, and the manner in which he recounts it, had been employed quite frequently. It is well for the reader to know that no formal sentence of excommunication was launched against any one by any of the missionaries during the whole mission period. Even Captain Rivera was merely notified that he had incurred excommunication for infringing on the Right of Sanctuary. Fr. Martínez, though filled with indignation, seems to have made the same announcement to the impudent corporal, and then forbade him to enter the church building during divine service. If what the missionary intimates took place, the soldier certainly had incurred excommunication or expulsion from the Church. Therefore no ceremony with "bell, book, and candle" was necessary; least of all were curses employed, as Hittell relates on the authority of the bibulous Alvarado. The story is of a piece with another from the same source. Alvarado claims that he himself was once excommunicated for being caught reading Archbishop Fenelon's *Telemaque!* As this French classic is used in our colleges, the reader may infer the value of the ex-governor's statements.

Still indignant at the outrage suffered, but which he fails to specify, Fr. Martínez again wrote to Argüello on the

[7] Fr. Martínez to Argüello, January 23rd, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," 1722. Ávila, the corporal, was removed by the governor soon after.

day after the occurrence mentioned: "The violation of the sacred character which distinguishes me as a servant of Jesus Christ has led me to close the door of the church on these insolent soldiers, whom I consider to have incurred this punishment by their action. It is not the first time that the ignorant soldiery has opposed me with insolence. Two individuals have passed through here towards the north, an Indian and a white man, it is said, stealing and killing and causing as much damage as they could. Thus they gratify themselves by destroying the fruit of the labors of the minister of Christ. Another kind of 'missionary', Pico by name, goes around creating drunkards. He also reaped his little harvest here, inasmuch as some have become drunk. Such occurrences make me believe that the soldiers of the guard serve no other purpose than destruction. Yet I must stay here a victim of the Gospel, and must suffer holy Religion to be injured which through the efforts of Catholic ancestors has been brought here." [8] Perhaps it was after the scene with the corporal that Fr. Martínez wrote to De la Guerra, "Out with the unbroken young mules, and let men of behavior come; for many of those in the service would be more useful elsewhere." [9]

It is no wonder that the Fathers felt like throwing down the burden of administering the mission temporalities, and that, for instance, Fr. Uría of Soledad wrote to Herrera: "Would that God willed that my desire, for which I prayed Him these fourteen years through the Poor Souls, might be realized. It is that these missions might be secularized, so that we Fathers might not be the stumbling block." [10]

---

[8] Fr. Martínez to Argüello, January 24th, 1825. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1723.

[9] Fr. Martínez to De la Guerra. No date. "De la Guerra Collection."

[10] "Que se secularizaren estas misiones para que no seamos los padres piedra y toque." Fr. Francisco X. Uría to Herrera, June 18th, 1826. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1905. By this secularization Fr. Uría of course only meant the transfer of the missions to the bishop and of the property to the Indians. Confiscation, as the Californians planned, was out of the question.

Even Fr. Antonio Peiri of San Luis Rey, who had been enthusiastic for independence and the republic, tired of his beloved mission and sought to be released. "I enclose," he writes to Governor Echeandía, "the accompanying petition which I address to the Most Excellent President of the Mexican people. By this means I ask of his well known generosity that he take from me the heavy burden of administering this mission, and grant me the enjoyment of the annual stipend, so that I may procure the necessary subsistence for my last days wherever I may most conveniently locate myself. I hope from your kindness that you will bring it to the notice of the President." [11] Whether Echeandía complied or not, we do not know; but Fr. Peiri's request was not granted.

About two months after his arrival Echeandía, doubtless upon complaint of the missionaries, made a pretense of wanting to lighten the burden of the missions. In a Bando or proclamation of January 1st, 1826, he addressed the inhabitants as follows: "The *Citizen* [12] José Maria de Echeandía, comandante-general and principal political chief [13] of both Californias. Having before me the contributions of the missions agreed upon by the Territorial Diputacion in the session of January 8th, 1824, and published as a decree by my predecessor Luis A. Argüello on the 17th of the same month, and thinking that some modification in the matter would be the most reasonable thing for the general interest of the territory and for the Missions in particular, I have decided in accord with the Rev. Fr. Prefecto, Fr. Vicente de Sarriá that from the first of the present month the contributions of the Missions of this territory *should be reduced to make them conform with what is contributed by the rest of the white inhabitants,* with the understanding that the

[11] Fr. Ant. Peiri to Echeandía, September 26th, 1826. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1838.

[12] The Mexicans, it will be seen, closely followed the French revolutionists in the matter of titles, as in many other things not so harmless.

[13] "Jefe Superior Político" took the place of "Gobernador."

supplies apportioned by the late Fr. Prefecto Mariano Payéras in September, 1824, shall remain in force after the manner of partial payments of the accounts which at the end of the year have to be collected in virtue of the aforesaid decree. The balance of which payment will determine the difference which is justly to be credited to the Missions." [14]

The burdens were not lightened for the missionaries who had to manage the temporal affairs of the missions; they had to furnish the supplies demanded by the soldiery as before. For the "difference credited to the Missions" they received worthless checks on Mexico as before. The document is valuable in that Echeandía by means of it publicly acknowledges that the missions not only paid taxes, but that they had been overtaxed,[15] a fact which Hittell with the mission despoilers and their following denied.

Nor were the Fathers long left in doubt with regard to the real animus of the first Mexican governor of California. When the demands for the supplies on always poor Mission San Diego were not honored as hastily as he expected, probably because the missionaries found it impossible to execute the orders, Echeandía went so far as to direct Lieutenant José Maria Ibarra, "since all conciliatory means had failed," as he claimed, to proceed with a force of soldiers to San Diego Mission, and to bring away all the grain which the mules could carry. Resistance was to be regarded as an overt act against the nation.[16] On June 7th, 1828, he pro-

---

[14] Echeandía, "Bando." "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. iv, 176; "Archb. Arch.," no. 1942. "Santa Cruz Archives," pp. 47-48. Bancroft Collection. Bancroft (iii, 88) acknowledges "I find no evidence that any part of the balance was paid in any instance."

[15] "Se nivelen las contribuciones de las Misiones de este territorio con las que hagan los demás habitantes que llaman de razón."—"Should be reduced, etc.," ut supra. See also Echeandía to Herrera, August 25th, September 6th, 1827. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1942-1943.

[16] "Que por ser ineficaces las medidas de comedimiento para conseguir del Padre de San Diego el indispensable sustento de esta guarnicion, pase con una escolta á dicha mision y se traiga las cargas de semillas de que sean capaces las mulas que de aquí

posed to the Mexican Government that the expense of maintaining friendly relations with the pagan Indians should be deducted from the sums due to the nearest missions.[17] So the missions which had no trouble with the Indians were to be mulcted out of what was due them because the soldiers incurred expenses for not being on friendly terms with the natives! Any other sense is not apparent in the order. On October 7th, 1828, Echeandía asked Fr. Narciso Durán to deliver to Lieutenant Ig. Martínez of San Francisco $800.[18] To Martínez he wrote on October 7th, 1828, that on receipt of the order he should at once proceed to Mission San José where $500 would be given him.[19] On October 22nd, 1828, Echeandía notified the missionaries of San Diego Mission that Ensign José Fernández, who had just disembarked with thirty artillerymen, would with his men take up his quarters at the mission.[20] On December 6th, 1829, Fr. Narciso Durán of Mission San José complained that his mission had to pay $200 under threat that force would be used, unless he complied.[21] So there was no end to the blood-letting.

Fr. Durán, writing to Herrera, reveals the cause of the everlasting destitution among the soldiery, just as Fr. Ibárra had done before. "In spite of the receipts from the tariff, from forced contributions, and in spite of our retrenching

---

se le entregarán para el efecto, bien entendido que cualquiera resistencia se ha de considerar como un atentato contra la Nacion." Echeandía to Ibarra, February 27th, 1827. "Cal. Arch.," Dept. Rec. v, 69-70. Whether the Indians had anything to eat did not concern Echeandía. We see no other conclusion.

[17] Echeandía to the Ministro de Hacienda. "Cal. Arch.," Dept. Rec. vi, 132-134. It seems the government took no action.

[18] "Entregar á Teniente Martínez $800." Echeandía to Fr. Durán. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 485-486.

[19] "Que luego que reciba el mando ocurra á Mision San José donde se le darán $500." Echeandía to Ignacio Martínez. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 485.

[20] "Que á Alférez José Fernández, que acaba de desembarcar, lo ha destinado á alojarse en la mision con los 30 artilleros que le acompañan." "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 505-506.

[21] Bancroft, iii, 89.

ourselves for the support of the military," he says, "in my opinion there will always be a notable deficit, because the soldiers are too numerous and not at all economical in their expenditures." [22] The reason for this was that they looked upon the mission as upon the cow which could be milked without feeding her; or as upon the goose that laid the golden eggs, which their indolence and greed finally killed.

Notwithstanding that the missionaries and their neophytes worked over time to meet the endless demands of the military for supplies, the new government of Mexico showed the friars no consideration or gratitude. On the contrary, their loyalty was questioned, and means devised to make their stay in the territory, which they had built up, unpleasant, if not impossible. No sooner had José M. Echeandía, the first Mexican governor, in October 1825 fixed his headquarters at San Diego, than he summoned the Fathers of the southern missions to meet him in conference. On April 28th, 1826, the Fathers José Sánchez, José María de Zalvidea, Antonio Peiri, and Fernando Martin with the alcalde of Los Angeles assembled at the residence of the governor. After some preliminary discussions Echeandía requested the missionaries to state their decision concerning the oath of allegiance to the Mexican Republic. In reply they informed the governor that they had no hesitation of taking the oath as long as they were not bound to take up arms against those of other political opinions. They offered to swear in the affirmative to this formula: "Do you swear to God and on the Holy Gospels that you will observe the Constitucion Federal and the Acta Constitutiva of the United States of Mexico as adopted October 4th, 1824," with the addition "as far as is compatible with our ministry and religious profession." [23] The governor in turn said that he had no

[22] Fr. Durán to Herrera, October 13th, 1826. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1922.

[23] "Jurais á Diós y los Santos Evangelios guardar la Constitucion Federal y Acta Constitutiva de los Estados Unidos Mejicanos sancionada en Méjico á cuatro de Octubre de 1824," añadiendo "en cuanto sea compatible con nuestro ministerio ó

authority to accept the modifying clause, and would shortly issue a circular calling upon each missionary to express his determination on the subject in writing.[24]

The most important problem, however, which faced Echeandía was the "secularization" of the missions. The new governor, as well as the administration which had appointed him, desired to remove the Franciscans from the control of the Indians and their property; but "the difficulties which surrounded Echeandía," says Bancroft, "were insurmountable. Had the territorial finances been in a sound condition, had the military force been thoroughly organized and promptly paid, had there been fifty curates at hand to take charge of new parishes, had the territory been to some extent independent of the missions[25]—even with these favorable conditions, none of which existed, secularization would have been a difficult task if not a risky experiment,[26] requiring for success at least the hearty co-operation of the friars. Under existing circumstances, however, against the will of the padres,[27] who, with their influence over the neophytes and their threats to retire en masse, were largely masters of the situation, any radical change in the mission status would bring ruin to the territory. The governor recognized the impossibility of

---

religiosa profesión." As the friars could not be combatants, any reasonable government would have been satisfied with this attitude of men whose business is to preach the Gospel of Christ, and who had given no reason to suspect that they would be disloyal; but, then, the Mexican Government has ever since demonstrated that it is not actuated by either reason or justice with regard to the ministers of the Catholic Church, notably the members of religious orders.

[24] "Cal. Arch.," Dept. St. Pap. i, 475-477.

[25] That is to say, the missions were supporting it almost entirely. One should think that in return the beneficiaries would have let the missions alone. That is all that the missions sighed for.

[26] Why not then let them alone? It is always risky for the thief to appropriate what does not belong to him.

[27] As we shall see presently, the Fathers offered to surrender the management of the temporalities. Bancroft misstates the case.

immediate action; but in accordance with the policy of his government, with his own republican theories, and with the urgings of *some prominent Californians who had already had their eyes on the mission lands,*[28] he had to keep the matter alive by certain experiments." [29]

At the very first conference with the missionaries of the southern district, Echeandía informed those present that unofficially he had received notice that the College of San Fernando had petitioned the Supreme Government to either dispense the friars from the oath or to relieve them of the management of the mission temporalities. The Fathers affirmed that the same news had been communicated to them by Fr. Vicente de Sarriá, and that they all desired to be freed from the burden of having to control the mission property at once.[30] The governor, however, declared that as yet it would not be safe to set the neophytes free from tutelage and make them provide for themselves. After a long discussion it was then agreed that the missionaries should set at liberty only those Indians of the San Diego and Santa Barbara military jurisdictions who, on account of their good behavior and habits, and the length of their service as Christians at the missions, appeared capable. A sufficient outfit should be provided, and with these emancipated neophytes a pueblo should be organized near San Fernando Mission. The necessary regulations for the government of the new settlement should be drawn up by the governor,

---

[28] This was the real reason for the hostility to the friars which Bancroft should always have emphasized, instead of, in opposition to the facts, claiming that the friars refused to let go of the property. Through inadvertence the hostile historian sometimes lets out the truth on this subject.

[29] Bancroft, "History of California," vol. iii, 101-102. The italics are ours.

[30] "Que todos deseaban exonerarse de semejante cargo; y por lo que respecta á ellos mismos desde luego suplican se les exonere." Yet Bancroft and the mission despoilers insist that the friars clung to the temporalities!

and the missionary of San Fernando should act as the pastor.[31]

Although, according to Beechey,[32] the Fathers warned the governor to go slowly, and to make experiments with a few neophytes at the said pueblo, Echeandía on July 25th, 1826, issued a circular emancipating from mission tutelage all such Indians within the military command of San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Monterey as might be found qualified to become Mexican citizens. In virtue of this decree the neophyte who wished to leave the missions might apply to the commander of the presidio of his jurisdiction. If the applicant had been a Christian from childhood, or for fifteen years, was married, or at least not a minor, and had some means of gaining a livelihood, and if the respective missionary's report was favorable, the commander was to issue a written permit through the missionary. This entitled the neophyte and his family to go whithersoever he pleased like other Mexican citizens, and his name was then erased from the mission padron or list. The provisions of this decree were in 1828 extended also to the San Francisco presidial district exclusive of San Rafael and San Francisco Solano. With regard to the neophytes who remained at the missions the same decree restricted punishing to the "mere correction" allowed to natural fathers in the case of their children. Unmarried males under age were to receive no more than fifteen blows in a week, and faults requiring severer penalties were to be referred to the military officials.[33]

"The natural result of these movements in behalf of the Indians," Hittell acknowledges, "was to make them restive and more or less disorderly,"[34] in other words, the plan proved a failure from the start. The neophytes, Beechey reports,[35] as might have been expected, soon fell into excesses, gambled away all their property, and were compelled to beg

[31] "Cal. Arch.," Dept. St. Pap. i, 475-477.

[32] Beechey, "Voyage," ii, 12-13.

[33] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap. x, 380-383.

[34] "History of California," ii, 92; Bancroft, iii, 104.

[35] "Voyage," ii, 320.

or to steal. Only one month after Echeandía had published his circular, an Indian of San Luis Rey in a fit of drunkenness at Los Angeles manifested the spirit of independence that was springing up among his people by publicly abusing the alcalde, the governor, and the nation, and declaring that the whites were only fit to be killed.[36] In April of the following year many of the neophytes of San Luis Rey and San Juan Capistrano refused to work in the fields, and the guards had to be increased to prevent outbreaks.[37] Though the experiments seemed to have been dropped, the ideas instilled into the Indians by Echeandía's impracticable emancipation scheme made such a great change in the neophytes that they never were as contented and submissive as before, and the missions seriously suffered both in spiritual and temporal matters. In truth, the decay of these establishments, for want of laborers, began with Echeandía's interference. More than that, he had the hardihood of reporting to the Mexican Government that the friars monopolized all the land, labor, and products of the territory![38]

After such legislation and consequent neophyte unwillingness, to blame the missionaries for not keeping the buildings in repair, for not cultivating the fields and not caring for the live-stock as of old, on the ground of indifference or for worse motives as the mission despoilers asserted, is folly. Nevertheless, be it remembered that during this whole period of antagonism to the missionaries the friars, with the Indian converts who remained faithful, had to support the hostile territorial government, in addition to paying the taxes levied on their produce.

Meanwhile Echeandía had collected a list of all the Indians

[36] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Benicia, lviii, 441-470.

[37] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. ii, 20-25.

[38] Bancroft, iii, 104. On October 7th, 1827, to show more of their solicitude (?) the territorial deputies issued a decree in twenty articles, signed by Echeandía and countersigned by A. V. Zamorano, obliging the missionaries to send to the territorial government a detailed inventory of their lands, the boundaries thereof, the slaughter and branding of cattle, the round-ups, corrals, titles to lands, etc. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Monterey ii.

who could read and write. They were comparatively so few that he on July 3rd, 1827, addressed a communication on the subject to Fr. Prefecto Sarriá. In reply Fr. Sarriá wrote: "I have received your letter of the 3rd instant in which you deem it well to order me to arrange in a manner most expedient that in all and at each of the missions of this territory primary schools be established, notably at San Francisco, Santa Clara, San Juan Bautista, San Carlos, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, San Buenaventura, San Fernando, San Gabriel, and San Juan Capistrano; and that of course each mission give the teacher a sufficient salary, who shall take care to give suitable instruction and teach the best morality.

"Although I should desire to be a punctual observer of your orders, as far as I can, and also for the reason that it might not be said or thought that I look upon them with indifference, nevertheless, from my personal knowledge of the missions in their present circumstances, I do not consider it at all feasible to carry out exactly what is commanded by your letter, at least not in every particular. However, I shall assist, as is just, so that in the manner most expedient, (to use the term employed in your letter) and in the way possible, the schools may be established as directed by the said letter. I shall to that effect notify all and every one of the missions by means of a circular of this same date. God keep your Honor many years. San Carlos, July 9th, 1827. Fr. Vicente Francisco de Sarriá." [39] Later on the governor directed that where no teachers could be procured those neophytes who could read and write should act as teachers, one for each ten pupils.[40]

---

[39] "Archb. Arch.," no. 1941. The reader will note the respectful tone here manifested, notwithstanding the overbearing manner of the governor towards Fr. Sarriá and the missionaries in general. The Fathers uniformly acted as gentlemen even though their enemies conducted themselves as boors and worse towards the priests.

[40] "Cal. Arch.," Dept. Records vi, 497.

CHAPTER XV.

The Franciscans and the Oath of Allegiance.—Fr. Sarriá's Circular.—Fr. Sarriá to Be Banished.—Absurd Charges Against Fr. Martínez.—Some Stipends Paid.—Fr. José Sánchez Appointed Presidente.—His Consternation.—Fr. Durán Consoles Him.—Politics in California.—Politicians in Mexico.—California a Penal Colony.—Sensational Flight of Fathers Ripoll and Altimira.—Unfounded Charges.

IN accordance with the announcement which he made in the first conference at San Diego, Governor Echeandía on June 3rd, 1826, directed the commanders of the four presidios to request each missionary in their military district to declare in writing whether or not he would take the oath of allegiance prescribed by the Mexican Government.[1] The replies from all the missions were in the hands of the officials named before the end of August. As might have been expected the majority of the friars expressed themselves as decidedly unwilling to swear allegiance to a government system which began its rule by declaring war on religious Orders, and which showed itself hostile to the very missionaries among the Indians for no other reason than that they wore a religious garb. Nevertheless, all declared they would obey the commands of the government as long as they did not militate against conscience.

The sentiments of the Franciscans are well set forth by Fr. Abella of San Carlos and Fr. Magín Catalá of Santa Clara. The former wrote in answer to Echeandía's demand that he would not swear; that he had come to the territory for God's sake, and for God's sake would depart, if they wanted to eject him; but that he would serve in matters spiritual and temporal with the fidelity corresponding to his sacred char-

---

[1] J. M. Estudillo to Echeandía, Monterey, July 7th, 1826. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1821; "Cal. Arch.," Dept. St. Pap. i, 492-493.

acter.[2] The venerable Fr. Magín Catalá, who was esteemed as a saint, on July 6th, 1826, wrote: "I respond that I cannot and consequently will not take said oath. In the thirty-three years during which I served at this mission I have never meddled with politics. If now I am to be distrusted, who with my sixty-six years and infirmities hope or believe to be near my end, then I swear to observe fidelity and obedience to the government and established authorities."[3] Five of the Fathers offered to take the oath with the clause "as far as is compatible with my ministry or religious profession," or "in everything not contrary to my conscience."[4] Fr. Peiri enthusiastically declared that he would swear to the Constitucion Federal, etc., without clause. Fr. Suñer also wanted to swear without reserve "because of the authentic promise in Articles 3 and 4 that the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Religion is and will be the only and permanent one."[5]

---

[2] "Dice: No jura; que por Dios vino á la tierra y por Dios se irá si lo echan; que servirá en lo espiritual y temporal con la fidelidad correspondiente á su caracter."—"Archb. Arch.," no. 1821.

[3] "Respondo que no puedo y por consiguiente no quiero hacer el dicho Juramento. En los 33 años que estoy en esta Mision nunca me he metido en asuntos políticos; y si ahora se quiere desconfiar de mí, que con la edad de 66 años y enfermedades espero ó juzgo estar cerca mi fin, juro guardar fidelidad y obediencia al Govierno y Autoridades constituidas." "Archb. Arch.," no. 1821. The nineteen friars, who like Abella and Catalá refused to swear allegiance, were: Altimira, Amorós, Arroyo, Cabot Juan, Cabot Pedro, Durán, Esténaga, Fortuni, Gil y Taboada, Jaime, Martinez, Oliva, Ordáz, Ripoll, Sancho, Uria, Viader, and Victoria. In truth the oath was absolutely superfluous. The Catholic, and especially the religious, is loyal in virtue of his Religion. The Mexican officials, if they were Catholic in any degree, must have known this. Therefore the demand for an extra oath was nothing but chicanery.

[4] These five missionaries were Boscana, Ibárra, Martín, Sánchez, and Zalvidea, to whom must be added Barona, though his reply does not appear in the official reports.

[5] "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1820; 1823; 1824; 1827; 1828; 1830; 1838; 1840. Fr. Durán in his reply remarked, "A law should be the expression of the whole people who are to obey it. Such is not

This simple-hearted Father failed to see that said clause in the Mexican Constitution was hardly more than a cloak to cover the animus of the framers of that document. As a rule, the men who governed in Mexico ever since had little regard for the Catholic Religion or any other.

Fr. Sarriá, the comisario prefecto, was the only friar not asked on this occasion to take the oath, because, as Lieutenant J. M. Estudillo explained,[6] this Father, then already under nominal arrest, was not regularly stationed at any particular mission. Besides, the Fr. Prefect's views were so well known that he had been singled out for expulsion, though his sentiments on the subject were identical with those of Fr. Catalá. The Mexican officials endeavored to make him appear disloyal, but failed. In a long circular dated August 7th, 1826, Fr. Sarriá defends his attitude, and at the same time reminds the friars of their duty in matters political. The whole exhortation culminates in the sentence, *"Subjecti estote omni humanae creaturae propter Deum."*[7] In other words, obey the government under which you live because Almighty God so directs. Notwithstanding this thoroughly Catholic and loyal principle, the powers that misruled Mexico, and which declared that they were of the "Apostolic, Roman Catholic" conviction, insisted that Fr. Sarriá should be expelled as a dangerous man! The good Fr. Prefect offered to leave the country voluntarily, and to proceed to the Sandwich Islands in order to preach the Faith there. The government rejected the proposition, and ordered him to be sent out of the country unconditionally.[8]

---

the case with the said Constitucion Federal." Now as then the anti-religious, rather anti-Christian, Leyes de la Reforma are not the expression of the majority. A handful of anti-Christian demagogues foisted them upon the unhappy Mexican people.

[6] Estudillo to Echeandía, July 7th, 1826. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1821.

[7] "Be ye subject to every human creature for God's sake." I Pet. ii, 13.

[8] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap. xix, 497-498.

About the middle of the following year, 1828, Echeandía wrote that he had repeatedly received orders for the Fr. Prefect's banishment, and that he would execute them at the first opportunity;[9] but in November he excused himself to the government for not complying because other missionaries would follow their Superior if he were sent away, and the result could only be disastrous to the missions and the territory in general.[10] For this reason all the missionaries save one were allowed to continue devoting themselves to the Indians, and to the distasteful task of providing subsistence and clothing for the idle troops and their families who otherwise must have starved. Indeed, Echeandía saw clearly that he must leave the friars in charge for the sole purpose of supporting the military. There were no others honest and capable enough to take the place of the faithful missionaries, otherwise the governor would scarcely have permitted the missions to retain their old guardians.

Early in 1827, however, rumors began to float about that some of the missionaries were preparing to leave the country secretly. A certain illiterate sailor, Vicente Cané by name, who had come from Monterey in 1825, related to Captain Miguel González that Fr. Luis Martínez of San Luis Obispo had placed $6000 consigned to Agustín Sánchez of Guaymas or Mazatlán on board the ship *Santa Apolonia,* and that he and Francisco Fernández had been present. González, "who was very violent against the missionaries," according to Bancroft,[11] reported the absurd story to the governor with the additional charge that Cané had also stated that Fr. Martínez, Fr. Juan Cabot, and Fr. A. Ripoll were not only planning to leave the country, but to destroy the missions by slaughtering the greater number of the cattle. González himself volunteered the statement that "those Fathers are nothing else than our enemies, and as Cané says, they are

---

[9] "Cal. Arch.," Dept. Rec. vi, 158.

[10] "Cal. Arch.," Dept. Rec. vi, 215-216.

[11] "History of California," iii, 93.

trying to incite an uprising in favor of Spain and against our beloved independence." [12]

Cané on June 3rd repeated his accusation before Governor Echeandía,[13] who seems to have paid no further attention to the story. Under date of November 10th, 1827, the Minister of Justice in Mexico made inquiries, but Cané's tale could not be verified.[14] Had the officials taken the trouble to examine the condition of Fr. Martínez's mission at that period they could have observed that, owing to the incessant demands of the troops, extreme poverty threatened the neophytes and their fatherly guide. Where he could have procured $6000 under such circumstances would have puzzled the hostile González himself, even if the Franciscan and College Rules had not strictly forbidden any such transaction. Fr. Martínez, however, was especially distasteful to the *paisanos,* as the native California settlers called themselves. Those who desired to be favored moreover knew that anything reported against this friar would be welcome to Echeandía.

Meanwhile from the College of San Fernando information and assistance arrived which greatly cheered the drooping spirits of the troubled missionaries. Fr. Juan Cortés, the procurator for the missions, on May 31st, 1827, notified Fr. Presidente Narciso Durán that, on the same day, two young Fathers [15] had set out for California in charge of

[12] "González to Echeandía;" no date. "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xix, 549-552. Bancroft, "History of California," iii, 760, says of González: "A bad fellow, if we credit the Californians; often in trouble, and finally sent away in 1830." If the private affairs of all monk-baiters the world over were examined it would be discovered that scarcely one of them could escape a similar characterization. Such was the case with the California calumniators invariably.

[13] "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap. xiv, 193-194; xi, 49.

[14] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Govt. St. Pap. iv, 76.

[15] A third young Father, Juan Moreno, joined them later, and the three arrived in California during September 1827. The other two friars, José Joaquín and Antonio Jimeno, were brothers and natives of the city of Mexico. "Sta. Barb. Arch.;" Baptismal Register, Mission San Buenaventura.

Don Enrique Virmond, who had offered to pay for anything the College wished to send to the missionary establishments. Fr. Cortés also related that the triennial chapter had been held on May 5th; that Fr. Juan Calzada had been elected



Signature of Fr. Juan Calzada.

guardian; and that the presidente would be appointed as soon as they should receive word from the government.[16] Another welcome news the Fr. Procurator communicated in a circular dated June 27th. It was to the effect that the administrator of the Pious Fund had paid the annual stipends due the missionaries for the three years 1820-1822. Payment had also been made for the year 1819, but the money had fallen into the hands of Síndico Escalante who had proved faithless.[17] For this reason steps had been taken to place the funds with a person of trust, "because at the present day money is the worst enemy which men can have in their houses," Fr. Cortés remarks. The amount turned over from the Pious Fund and which covered the three years from October 1st, 1819, to September 30th, 1822, reached the sum of $42,680.50. On the advice of the Fr. Guardian and the discretos it was all on June 29th forwarded to the síndico at Tepíc, Juan de Martiarena, who had it in charge subject to the dispositions of the missionaries. Of this sum there was due to twelve missions, which at that period still had two missionaries, each $2400. The other missions which had been in charge of only one friar, or of two only for a time, also received their share at the rate of $400 a year

[16] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[17] He was a layman who had charge of the alms donated to the friars of the College. Of course he was discharged, but whether he restored the money is not known.

for each Father. San Rafael's portion, for instance, was only $1200, because only one Father was stationed there during that period. In his circular Fr. Cortés points out the amount due each mission down to *half a real,* or six and one-fourth cents. This shows that the College, despite its large outlay for the missions, retained not as much as a penny of the allowance coming to the California friars from the Pious Fund. The stipends not paid for the period beginning with October 1st, 1811, and ending with September 30th, 1818, Fr. Cortés says must be regarded as lost. "It would be useless to make application for them." [18]

On July 13th Síndico Martiarena himself notified the Fathers that the $42,680.50 were in his hands, and that the money was at their disposal.[19] He was probably directed to convert it into merchandise and church goods, or to pay debts incurred for such goods. There are no allusions made in the records concerning the transaction, except that in one case Martiarena was asked to pay the cost of forwarding the holy Oils from Guadalajara.[20]

Fr. Durán's term of office as presidente of the missions was drawing to a close; but the government probably objected to his reappointment for the reason that he was *persona non grata* and marked for expulsion, though he was one of the ablest missionaries, and second only to Fr. Sarriá for learning, business ability, and adherence to duty. The College on June 9th, 1827, therefore, appointed Fr. José Sánchez of Mission San Gabriel.[21] This missionary was a good, zealous, and simple-minded religious, who had no thought of aspiring to aught but to do his duty to the Indians faithfully. No wonder the news of his appointment threw him into the deepest consternation. In two letters to Fr. Durán he gave way to his grief, and declared that

---

[18] Fr. Cortés, "Circular," June 27th, 1827. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[19] "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[20] Fr. Durán to Fr. Sánchez, September 30th, 1827. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[21] Fr. Guardian Calzada to Fr. Sánchez, June 9th, 1827. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

he would renounce the office and resign it into the hands of Fr. Prefect Sarriá. Fr. Durán, who had also received the information that he had been superseded by Fr. José Sánchez, replied to the latter's lamentations: *"Durum est contra stimulum calcitrare."*[22] Your Reverence is the presidente canonically elected, and the Fr. Prefect has absolutely no power to accept your renunciation under pain of nullity. That is the privilege of the discretory. Hence you may conclude that Your Reverence will have to bear the cross until the discretory relieves you, which I doubt it will do because it seems the government intervened. I well understand that Your Reverence finds yourself enveloped as though in a dark cloud without finding the door or the window through which to escape. This also happened to me; and even the Rev. Fr. Prefecto confessed to me that he had experienced a like feeling while in office; but there is no reason to be terrified. The exercise of the office will open doors and windows to you, and after a little while in office Your Reverence will find yourself in condition for the regular discharge of the duties. In this way the Rev. Fr. Prefecto consoled me in similar troubles, and such was the result indeed." [23]

From the same letter we learn that some changes had taken place in making the mission reports since the Spanish kings had been eliminated. "Three copies of the different reports on the General State of the Missions, on the Spiritual Conditions, of the Biennial Report, and of the Report on the Compliance with Easter Duty must be drawn up," Fr. Durán instructs his crestfallen successor. "One copy is sent to the College, one to the Fr. Prefecto, and the third is intended for the archives. Of the original reports made out annually by the individual missionary of each mission one copy is used to compile the General Report and then filed away in the archives, and one copy goes to the governor."

---

[22] "It is hard to kick against the goad." (Acts of the Apostles, ix, 5.)

[23] Fr. Durán to Fr. Sánchez, November 24th, 1827. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

Formerly a copy went to the Bishop of Sonora, but since his death no report was transmitted.[24]

We have now to take brief notice of the political situation in California. The life of the last legislative assembly expired with the session which discussed the proposition of secularizing the missions, and removing the missionaries who declined to take the unconditional oath on the Mexican Constitution. About the beginning of 1827 Echeandía ordered the election of new diputados. On February 18th five electors met at San Diego to choose the members of the new assembly and a delegate to the Mexican Congress. José de la Guerra was unanimously elected to represent California at the capital for the term 1827-1828. Gervásio Argüello was designated substitute. De la Guerra sailed for Mexico in January 1828, but being a Spaniard he was not admitted to the sessions. He therefore hastened back to avoid more serious trouble. Argüello then took his seat. The members chosen on February 19th, 1827, to constitute the assembly were Mariano Estráda, Tibúrcio Tapia, Ignácio Martínez, Antonio Maria Ortega, Juan Bandini, Anastasio Carrillo, and Antonio Buelna. The three substitutes were Nicolás Alviso, Joaquin Estudillo, and Romualdo Pacheco.[25] The sessions began at Monterey on June 14th, 1827, and were held at short intervals until September 20th; but there was great difficulty to maintain a quorum. On September 1st Mariano Estráda and Antonio Buelna were the only members in or near Monterey. These two had to call in the town council of Monterey, and with their aid elect five provisional members, who lived in or near the capital. They were Francisco Pacheco, Estévan Munrás, Juan José Rocha, Mariano G. Vallejo, and José Castro. They were sworn in

[24] The Metropolitan Chapter of the Cathedral of Mexico on January 4th, 1828, nominated the Rev. José Salvador Salia to succeed the deceased Bishop Bernardo de Espíritu Santo, O. F. M., as Bishop of Sonora. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[25] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Los Angeles, x, 2. Pacheco was ensign of the engineers, who had come up with Echeandía and Agustín V. Zamorano.

on September 19th. These with the regularly elected representatives composed the diputacion. Juan B. Alvarado had been appointed secretary of the legislative body on June 26th.[26] The deliberations lacked interest as far as the missions were concerned, except that on July 7th Echeandía proposed to change the name California to that of Moctezuma. The resolution was adopted on the 13th, but that is as far as the matter went.[27]

In obedience to a proclamation of Governor Echeandía, issued July 30th, 1828, an electoral committee assembled at San Diego on October 6th. This body reorganized the assembly by choosing the four new members, Carlos A. Carrillo, Pio Pico,[28] Vicente Sánchez, and Tibúrcio Castro. The hold-overs were Juan Bandini, Anastásio Carrillo, and Antonio Buelna. The substitutes were Manuel Domínguez, Salvio Pacheco, and Carlos Castro. No regular sessions were held in that year, nor in the next. On October 5th, Lieutenant José Joaquín Maitorena was chosen delegate to Congress with Santiago Argüello as substitute. In December 1829 Echeandía again started for the north. At Monterey he succeeded with some difficulty in securing the presence of Buelna and José T. Castro, with the substitutes Salvio Pacheco and Carlos Castro, to meet in regular session on July 10th, 1830. Alvarado acted as secretary.[29] The proceedings of this assembly will be related in the proper place.

Meanwhile, 1828-1831, political conflicts, revolutions and counter-revolutions for the supremacy[30] had already begun to exercise selfish schemers in Mexico, and to disturb the

---

[26] This was the first public appearance of the two worthies Mariano Vallejo and Alvarado at the age of 19 and 18 respectively.

[27] Hittell, ii, 90-91; Bancroft, iii, 36-38; Fr. Sarriá to Echeandía, July 8th, 1827. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1940.

[28] His first appearance in politics at the age of 27 years.

[29] Hittell, ii, 96; Bancroft, iii, 41-45.

[30] Guerrero was duly installed as President of Mexico on April 1st, 1829, but sentenced to death and then shot on February 14th, 1831.

people of the republic which was such only in name. The welfare of all classes, least of all of the religious, was not on the program of the office chasers. The respective congress would signalize its existence by adopting laws of which some seemed intended merely to provide positions for certain individuals. Thus for California an assistant-inspector of the military was sent to aid Echeandía, though the territory had had no use for such an official since the days of Fages and Soler. The person named was Lieutenant-Colonel José Maria [31] Padrés, who came up from Loreto to San Diego on July 1st, 1830. "To supply another need of the territory," Bancroft remarks, "where there were as yet no lawyers, the Licenciado Rafael Gómez was sent to California as legal adviser." He arrived about the same time as Padrés.[32]

A measure of the general government which aroused much indignation on the coast was the attempt to utilize California as a penal colony for Mexican criminals. As early as 1825 the military reinforcement despatched to Monterey contained eighteen convicts. In 1828 as many as fifty persons were sentenced for various offenses to terms in the California presidios.[33] Bancroft mentions a list of eighty convicts brought to the coast, and they were followed by sixty criminals before December 1829. The Californians protested, but in February 1830 eighty convict colonists in charge of a sergeant and twelve soldiers arrived from Acapulco at San Diego, and reported that more were coming. Thirty of the worst men were taken over to Santa Cruz Island, opposite Santa Barbara, with a supply of cattle and fish-hooks to make a living as well as they could. The rest with fifty more arrivals in July were distributed among private em-

[31] Beautiful religious names in Mexican officialdom by no means indicate a pious spirit in the bearers. The credit belongs to the mothers. It was thus in the case of Padrés and California officials generally.

[32] Bancroft, iii, 46-47. Manuel Jimeno Casarín, brother of the Jimeno Fathers, came up as accountant for the customhouse; Francisco Pérez Pacheco arrived as comandante de resguardo.

[33] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap. x, 338-339; xi, 167.

ployers.[34] The effect of this class of immigrants on the neophytes of California, which already abounded in worthless characters, can be imagined. That the missionaries lost courage, and longed daily more and more to be relieved of their burden by banishment or death, will scarcely cause surprise.

Early in 1828 a sensation was caused by the flight of two missionaries. Fathers Antonio Ripoll of Santa Barbara and José Altimira of San Buenaventura, thoroughly discouraged, and probably expecting expulsion any way, on January 23rd went aboard the American brig *Harbinger*, and bade farewell to California in whose missions irreligious authorities would not let them labor in peace. Under the regulations of the College Fr. Ripoll was entitled to retire, as he had served far more than ten years. Fr. Altimira had been connected with the College only nine years. Though the government intended to banish the missionaries for no other reason than that their cradles had stood in Spain, and though the friars were under no obligations to the politicians at the head of the State affairs, the flight annoyed the Mexican Government not a little. Agreeably to their own mercenary character, the so-called Californians, that is to say the *paisanos*, notably Mariano Vallejo and Alvarado, expressed suspicions that the fugitives had carried away the wealth of the missions.[35]

Governor Echeandía, who happened to be at Santa Barbara, instituted an investigation, and on January 25th issued orders for the seizure of the *Harbinger* should the vessel land at any California port. Captain Steele of the ship,

---

[34] Bancroft, iii, 48-49; Hittell, ii, 88.

[35] As we shall learn in the course of time, these two worthies with others regarded carrying away the wealth of the missions as a right reserved to Californians. It is significant that Bancroft usually disdains to utilize their statements in the text. He crowds them into footnotes far more often. The reason he gives is that "none of the writings of this class," i. e., Osio's, Vallejo's, Alvarado's, Bandini's, and let us add Pico's, "nor all combined, would be a safe guide in the absence of the original records." (Vol. iv, 762.)

COLONISTS COMING FROM CHURCH, SANTA BARBARA.

however, took no chances, and thus the two friars escaped to their native land.[36] At the judicial examination on February 1st nothing more was elicited from Mayordomo Vicente Pino of San Buenaventura, Alférez Rodrigo del Pliego, and George Coleman, an Englishman whom Fr. Altimira had baptized but four days previous to his flight, and to whom he had entrusted the keys of the mission, than that some days before his departure Fr. Altimira had sent to Santa Barbara two barrels of wine, one barrel of soap, one barrel of olives, a keg of vinegar, a chest, and two small boxes of chocolate. Furthermore, it was found that the Father had taken along, after telling Coleman that he went away for treatment of his health, a small box of cigars and some books.[37]

From the *Harbinger,* while still at anchor before Santa Barbara, Fr. Altimira on January 23rd addressed a long and affectionate letter to George Coleman. In it he says that "on account of happenings which neither you nor the poor Indians, my dear neophytes, have caused, I embarked and am resolved to make the long voyage to Spain, my mother country in this world. . . . You will not deliver the keys nor anything else that I left in your charge to any one without the express order of the governor, whom I am notifying of my departure. The key to my room is in the keeping of Fr. Antonio Jaime and Fr. Francisco Suñer at Santa Barbara. In the drawer of the table in my room are the papers which show the actual state of the mission. I doubt not that God will bless and console the poor neophytes; for it is certain that the Fr. Prefect, to whom I send word of my going away, will soon provide a missionary for the mission." [38]

When the report of the flight of the two friars reached Mexico, the government proposed making the College suffer

---

[36] "Cal. Arch.," Dept. Rec. vi, 721-722; 730; Sup. Gov., St. Pap., Decrees and Despatches, iv, 184-186.

[37] "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Benicia, lxvii, 219-221; Bancroft, iii, 93-94.

[38] "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Benicia, lxvii, 222-225.

for the chagrin. The Minister of Justice demanded to know of the Fr. Superior whether the two friars had left their missions by order of the College. Fr. Arreguín fortunately could reply that he had no knowledge of the affair. The Minister then wanted him to obtain the particulars from the Fr. Prefect. As Fr. Sarriá could report similarly, the government dropped the matter.[39]

"Though Alvarado and Vallejo," says Bancroft,[40] "accuse the padres of having stolen large sums, and their methods of flight favored the suspicion, I suppose that a few thousand dollars [41] was probably all they took, and that they had but little difficulty in justifying the act to their own satisfaction, in view of the past stipends, either unpaid or invested in supplies for the Indians. In their own letters the padres said they had left the mission property intact,[42] and Mrs. M. Ord [43] declares that they took no money along, but only some provisions, which is doubtless true. Her father was the síndico of the Franciscans in California. With him the donations or alms for the Fathers, whenever they received them and had no immediate use for them, were deposited. Out of this fund, after the Mexican independence, De la Guerra provided for the personal needs of the friars. Even in case the Mexican Government allowed the missionaries to enjoy the stipends coming to them from the Pious Fund, which was not probable, such money had to be used according to the intention of the original benefactors or founders of the Pious Fund, that is to say, for the actual

[39] Fr. Arreguín to Fr. Sarriá, March 26th, 1828. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[40] "History of California," iii, 94.

[41] Bancroft is generous, but he qualifies his generosity with an ungenerous insinuation quite in keeping with his general plan.

[42] The books were in perfect order and nothing was missing at either San Buenaventura or Santa Barbara.

[43] "No llevaron ninguna cantidad de dinero, y si solo algunos viveres para el viage. Todo el dinero que tenia la mision se quedó en ella." "Ocurrencias," 22-23. Mrs. Maria Ord was the daughter of José de la Guerra, and therefore well able to know the facts. She also relates that Fr. Ripoll wept as he took leave of some Indians.

needs of the missionaries on the spot and for the Indians. This was scrupulously observed by the Franciscans from the beginning, as we have had occasion to show at various times. Personal donations to the Fathers heretofore had also been applied to the same end.

Now that the missionaries were expecting to be banished at any moment, and had to provide for themselves, they seem to have deposited all personal alms with De la Guerra, who disposed of them for the needs of the respective Fathers subject to the approval of the Fr. Presidente or Fr. Prefect. It was out of such deposits doubtless that De la Guerra paid the cost of the voyage to Spain, and that is all they could accept; for in their native country they would have to live according to their vows in poverty just as well. "Stealing large sums," as Vallejo and Alvarado charged, would have been to no purpose. Those two worthies, however, tried to ease their own conscience and to cover their own misdeeds by making people believe that the friars had been dishonest. There is no documentary evidence that a friar appropriated as much as a dollar for himself, relatives, College, or the Church; but there is abundant evidence that the traducers of the missionaries were not nearly as scrupulous in money matters as their victims. All will appear in due time.

CHAPTER XVI.

Spying on Missionaries.—Result.—The Friars Necessary for the Welfare of the Territory.—Beechey's Opinion.—Fr. Martínez Asks and Receives Passport.—Numerous Conversions.—Beechey's Description of Mission Methods.—Mexico Decrees Expulsion of All Spaniards.—The College of San Fernando on Verge of Extinction.—Fr. Arreguín.—Mission Funds.—The Fathers Again Refuse to Swear Allegiance.—Echeandía's Excuse for Inaction.—List of Missionaries and Their Condition.—Echeandía Pleads for Them.—Another Decree of Expulsion.—Action of the Town Councils of San José and Monterey.—Fathers Demand Their Passports.

GOVERNOR ECHEANDÍA as well as the Central Government keenly felt the humiliation which the flight of the two friars entailed. While asking Fr. Sarriá to send a substitute for Fr. Altimira to San Buenaventura, he took occasion to urge the Fr. Prefect to use his authority so that no such "scandal" occurred again.[1] Fr. Francisco Uría was accordingly transferred from Soledad to the deserted mission. Fr. Francisco Suñer, indeed, lived at the mission, but he had lost his eyesight, and was therefore of little help beyond hearing confessions or preaching and giving catechetical instructions.[2] If the following incident be a specimen of the treatment the Fathers received at the hands of officials, the missionaries can hardly be blamed for desiring to leave the ungrateful territory. They would all doubtless have departed with or without government permission, had not the fate of their neophytes deterred them.[3] What ac-

---

[1] Echeandía to Fr. Sarriá, January 25th, 1828. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 722-723.

[2] Libro de la Mision de San Buenaventura.

[3] "The padres, dreading the worst, were very discontented, and many would willingly have quitted that country for Manila." Beechey, "Narrative," ii, 14. Beechey was in the territory at the time.

tually happened may be gathered from a letter addressed to the Fr. Presidente José Sánchez of San Gabriel:

"Puerto do San Pedro, June 3rd, 1828. Rev. Father—As soon as I arrived at the pueblo[4] from the mission,[5] I had scarcely got seated before I received orders to go to the alcalde,[6] who questioned me as to my business at the mission.



Signature of Fr. Gerónimo Boscana.

I told him that I went to see about the things for the Padres at the islands. He asked me when the cart was going to the beach. I told him, in the morning. When I arrived at the rancho I found five soldiers, headed by Antonio Maria Lugo, waiting, as I supposed, for the cart which passed whilst they were at the rancho; but they were apprised of it by somebody, and they instantly set off in pursuit. In about three-quarters of an hour one soldier returned to the rancho and told me to follow him. I went with him and found they had stopped the cart at the river, and had taken everything out. They examined minutely everything in the cart, even searched in the corn, and said they were looking for dollars which, they supposed belonged to the Padre and were hidden. They also took the letters from the Indian and those directed to me. They opened and perused them and of the others they copied the directions. I am very sorry they have such a bad opinion of us, Padre, but perhaps it may be for the better, as it may be the means of our distinguishing our friends from our enemies. We

[4] Los Angeles.

[5] San Gabriel.

[6] José Antonio Ezequiel Carrillo. Echeandía on March 21st had warned him that Fathers Sánchez and Gerónimo Boscana of San Gabriel were secretly exporting money and other articles from San Pedro! In the search nothing was discovered. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. viii, Miscellanea, 402.

received in the cart the whole of the things specified in your letter for which I am obliged to you, etc. Brig *Karimoko*. John Lawlor by John Wilkinson." [7]

On the receipt of this communication, Fr. Sánchez, then presidente of the missions, at once indignantly protested to the governor, and demanded his passport. "As presidente of the missions," he wrote, "I cannot behold with indifference the infamous injury which has been inflicted upon me. . . . I therefore ask for my passport in order to leave the province. I want to embark on the frigate *Princesa*. I want to leave, or rather I want to fly away from San Gabriel; for I shall take nothing along but my Breviary." [8] Later, August 18th, 1828, he again protested against spying into his papers and affairs. In reply Echeandía endeavored to pacify the justly indignant Fr. Presidente. "With regard to the charges made against Your Reverence on account of which you demand your passport to leave the country," he said, "I have to state that they are unfounded. I have ordered the alcalde of Los Angeles to appear before me with witnesses in order to explain his action, and I invite you to attend or to name some person to represent you." [9] This sounds strange in view of the fact that it was Echeandía himself who had caused Carrillo to proceed against the missionary. It seems Fr. Sánchez allowed himself to be persuaded to drop the matter, and for the sake of the poor neophytes to stay at his post. At all events, he never left it except for the world where unselfish zeal receives full compensation.

Several other friars demanded their passports. Among them was the famous Fr. Luis Martínez of San Luis Obispo. When Echeandía noticed the growing dissatisfaction among

---

[7] "Archb. Arch.," no. 2025. The letter was written in English.

[8] "Lo mas pronto quiero marchar, mejor dire volar, de San Gabriel; pues solamente llevare conmigo mi breviario." Fr. Sánchez to Echeandía, June 8th, 1828. "Archb. Arch.," no 2031.

[9] Fr. Sánchez to Echeandía, August 18th, 1828. "Archb. Arch., no. 2031; Echeandía to Fr. Sánchez, August 21st, 1828. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 393-395.

the missionaries he advised the government to grant passports to all who wanted them.[10] This was deemed hazardous; for it was plain that probably the most of them would avail themselves of the opportunity to leave the country which repaid past and present devotion to the cause of California with indignities. As yet the government needed the poor friars, if for nothing else than to prevent the neophytes from running away. This, of course, would have compelled the soldiers and colonists to perform the labor for which they relied upon the Indians. What the result would be was set forth by Beechey.[11] "The missions," he wrote at the time, "have hitherto been of the highest importance to California, and the government cannot be too careful to promote their welfare, as the prosperity of the country in a great measure is dependent upon them, and must continue to be so until settlers from the mother country can be induced to resort thither. The neglect of the missions would not long precede the ruin of the presidios, and of the whole of the district; thus, while the missions furnish the means of subsistence to the presidios, the body of men they contain keeps the wild Indians in check, and prevents their making incursions on the settlers."

This view seems to have been adopted by the government, and hence it was that no permits to leave were granted to the Franciscan friars. In the case of Fr. Martínez, whom in a letter to the Minister of War[12] Echeandía described as "one of the most furious enemies of our system," the governor took it upon himself to issue the passport demanded as early as 1826. His principal reason, however, was "that, having information that Fr. Luis Ant. Martínez intended to depart on the frigate, he would give him the passport so that he might embark without causing 'scandal'

---

[10] Echeandía to Minister of Justice, June 30th, 1828. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 221.

[11] "Narrative of a Voyage," ii, 14-15.

[12] Echeandía to Minister of War, July 26th, 1827. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 90-91.

by his flight;"[13] but Fr. Martínez failed to make use of his permit, for the reason that Fr. Sarriá advised all friars to stay at their post lest the neophytes suffer spiritual and temporal damage.[14]

What surprises is that, through all these years of petty persecution of the friars and general oppression of the missions, the Fathers could keep their neophytes together, nay, that they could attract savages and bring them under the yoke of the Gospel until there was not a pagan left on the whole stretch of two hundred and twenty-eight leagues from San Diego to San Francisco Solano; but such is the fact which Fr. Durán reports at the beginning of the year 1827. Thirty missionaries still served the Indians and white people unselfishly. Twice a day the neophytes still recited the Doctrina and the usual prayers in common. The Rosary, the Way of the Cross, the Sunday Mass, and the solemnities of the year were observed as of yore. The Sacraments were received. At the hour of death all, neophytes, soldiers, and colonists, availed themselves of the Sacraments of Penance, Holy Eucharist, and Extreme Unction.

To the deep regret of the zealous Fathers numerous pagans east of the coast range still eked out a precarious living independent of their chiefs or any one else, save in time of war; yet from among them many a convert continued to join the missions under the fatherly rule of the missionaries. One drawback, however, Fr. Durán deplored very much, and he was the first one in California to touch the subject. It was the absence of a bishop who might at least give Confirmation; for since the death of Fr. Lasuén in 1803 no missionary had enjoyed the privilege of bestowing that Sacrament.[15] Another circumstance is noticed in the subsequent report for the year 1828: the Indian population was

[13] Echeandía to Fr. Martínez, September 23rd, 1828. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. xix, 6-7.

[14] Fr. Sarriá to Echeandía, October 4th, 1828. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2035. Echeandía, Carta, December 6th, 1828. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 240-241.

[15] "Informe Bienal" for 1824-1826. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

decreasing. Whereas Fr. Pres. Durán for the year 1826 was able to report 20,178 neophytes at the twenty-one missions, Fr. Sánchez, his successor, could report only 18,731.[16] The highest number, 11,576 males and 9620 females, or 21,196 Indian neophytes, was reached at the close of 1821.[17] The falling-off began with the year 1822.

The English navigator Fred. W. Beechey deserves a brief notice here. He anchored at San Francisco from November 6th to December 28th, 1826, and again in December 1827. He visited the missions of Santa Clara and San José, and also stopped at Monterey. His descriptions on the whole are fair. Even that which sounds unfavorable, if interpreted by the circumstances of Mexican misrule and settlers' misrepresentations, will be found to speak well for the missionaries and their efforts. While the habitations and character of the Indians at Mission San Francisco displeased him, Beechey says of Mission San José: "All was neatness, cleanliness, and comfort. . . . The general character of the padres is kind and benevolent, and in some missions the converts are so attached to them that I have heard them declare they would go with them, if they were obliged to quit the country. . . . The Indians are in general well clothed and fed; they have houses of their own, and if they are not comfortable, it is, in a great measure, their own fault.[18] Their meals are given them three times a day, and consist of thick gruel made of wheat, Indian corn, and sometimes acorns, to which at noon is generally added meat. Clothing of a better kind than that worn by the Indians is given to the officers of the missions, both as a reward for their services, and to create an emulation in others."[19]

---

[16] "Informe Bienal" for 1826-1828. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[17] "Informe General" for 1821. "Sta. Barb. Arch." See facsimile report at end of the volume.

[18] That was doubtless the reason why the neophytes at Mission Dolores offered such a poor appearance; but then Langsdorff himself "terms the neophytes of San Francisco pigmies compared with them" (i. e., with those of San José, Fr. Durán's mission). Beechey, ii, 21.

[19] Beechey, "Narrative," ii, 21-22.

As yet Spain had not acknowledged the independence of Mexico. The men in power therefore resolved to vent their anger at the refusal on the inhabitants of Spanish birth. In May, 1827, Congress began by decreeing that no person of Spanish nativity should hold any public, civil or military office. On December 20th a decree was issued which commanded all Spaniards to leave the country within six months. Only those were exempt who were sixty years of age, those who had married Mexican wives, and some others, after they took the oath of allegiance.[20] This law had a disastrous effect on the College of San Fernando because the community was almost entirely composed of Spanish friars. The Fr. Guardian and the discretos at first resolved to disband and to allow every member to go wheresoever he found accommodations. Later they reconsidered this sweeping measure. They elected a vicar from among the few Mexican Fathers who might govern the remnant as well as he could. Fr. Ildefonso Maria Arreguín, the friar chosen for the position, endeavored to obtain a dispensation from the law of expulsion in favor of the Spaniards in his monastery; but his petition was rejected. All that the government would grant was that Fathers Lull, Dantí, Suso, and Cortés might stay.[21] These friars, however, declined to accept the concession denied their countrymen, and rather followed them into exile. The result was that only Fr. Arreguín, three Mexican Fathers, two invalid Spanish friars, six lay-brothers, and a few Tertiary brothers remained to attend to the grand church [22] and monastery of San Fernando and continue the religious exercises as long as the politicians might tolerate them.[23]

To prevent certain extinction Fr. Arreguín petitioned the Holy See to grant to the small community the same facul-

---

[20] Alamán, "History of Mexico," tom. v, lib. ii, cap. xi, 828-830.

[21] Fathers Lull, Dantí, and Cortés had labored in California.

[22] The church of San Fernando is even now the largest church edifice in the City of Mexico next to the famous cathedral.

[23] Fr. Arreguín to Fr. Sarriá, March 26th, 1828; Don Francisco González, August 20th, 1828. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

ties possessed by the Apostolic College with regard to elections and the reception of applicants from other colleges or provinces, and to enjoy the same graces, indults, and faculties conceded to missionary colleges. Pope Leo XII. on December 7th, 1828, graciously confirmed Fr. Arreguín's election to the office of vicar, and granted "all that the said Fr. Ildefonso and his associates asked for in the petition, the Constitutions of the Holy See and of the Order issued on the subject to the contrary notwithstanding." [24]

"My only desire is," Fr. Arreguín concludes a letter communicating the foregoing information to Fr. Sarriá, "to preserve the College, even at the cost of many hardships. I



Signature of Fr. Ildefonso Arreguín.

beseech Your Reverence and all the Fathers to remain united with this College, well assured that you have brethren here who wish to co-operate with Your Reverences for the welfare and spiritual progress of souls, for such is the object of our Apostolic Institute." Fr. Sarriá replied on October 25th, 1828. He quietly acknowledged the jurisdiction of Fr. Arreguín by sending a list of the California Fathers, and asked that the new Superior procure a quantity of holy Oils.[25]

Don Francisco Cortina González, the successor of the faithless Escalante in the office of síndico, also informed Fr. Sarriá that Fr. Juan Cortés, who had for many years been procurator of the California missions, on his forced

[24] "Peticion á Su Santidad." "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[25] Fr. Arreguín to Fr. Sarriá, March 26th, 1828; Fr. Sarriá to Fr. Arreguín. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

return to Spain in January, 1828, had turned over all the funds not yet expended for the missions. The sum amounted to $1113 and half a real. Don Ildefonso González del Castillo on January 4th delivered to the síndico $1405, and on March 31st $600 additional. These $3118 and half a real remained from the stipends paid by the administrator of the Pious Fund in 1823. Out of this amount, González reported, he had on July 4th, 1828, paid $200 for the traveling expenses to California of Fr. José Joaquín Jimeno, and $106.50 for a six months' subscription to the "Águila." The balance he held subject to the order of the Fr. Prefecto.[26]

In the meantime Governor Echeandía had again received orders to send Fr. Comisario-Prefecto Sarriá out of the territory for refusing to swear allegiance to the Mexican Republic. The decree came from the Minister of Justice and Ecclesiastical Affairs, Ramón Arizpe, a secular priest who devoted himself to politics after the manner of the so-called Liberals. He belonged to the Freemasons of the Yorkish Rite, was rabidly anti-Spanish, and not friendly to religious.[27] That kind of unworthy ecclesiastics invariably receives canonization at the hands of anti-Catholics. Hence Bancroft's declaration that "Arizpe was a great man, an excellent clergyman and pastor, wise, just, charitable, humble." [28] In obedience to earlier orders from Arizpe, Echeandía had already commanded Fr. Sarriá to surrender the office of prefect of the missions to Fr. Durán, and he had directed the latter to proceed to San Diego for the purpose of taking the oath.[29]

---

[26] Don Francisco González to Fr. Sarriá, August 20th, 1828. "Sta. Barb. Arch." A copy of the periodical probably went to each mission. The síndico may have presumed that it was welcome and very useful, if not necessary.

[27] "Inflexible Arizpe, que tenia especial ojeriza á los frailes Españoles, no se detuvo por esto" (i. e., even though the missions suffered), "en dar la orden para que saliesen los misioneros Californios." Alamán, "Historia de Mejico," tom. v, 831.

[28] "History of Mexico," v. 31. It will be well for Arizpe if the Eternal Judge found these qualities in him. The facts from the standpoint of a Christian proclaim the very opposite.

[29] See chapter xiii, this section.

The Fr. Prefect quite properly ignored the impertinent mandate, because it was beyond the jurisdiction of the governor to take or confer a purely religious office. As to Fr. Durán, he flatly refused to leave his Mission of San José for the long, useless journey to San Diego. He could not intrude himself into the place of his prelate at the behest of a secular official anyway.

In effect, the friars were requested to swear allegiance to the faithless politicians who had managed to plow their way to power, and then styled themselves the Republic of the United States of Mexico. They were not truly representative of the whole people. To-morrow another clique might overthrow them and demand another oath of allegiance to themselves. Such changes indeed came to pass, so that only fifteen years later Fr. Soria, a Zacatecan Franciscan, could write: "To-day Peter governs, to-morrow John rules, and everything is confusion. We change our constitutions like our coats, and our government ministers like our hats." [30]

The governor saw no way to enforce Arizpe's demand, and therefore allowed the matter to rest; but to the Minister of Justice he excused himself for not executing the order of expulsion on the ground that if the Fr. Prefect were compelled to leave California the rest of the dissatisfied religious, who formed the majority, would also depart. "This in my judgment," he wrote, "would cause much disturbance in the territory, and the absence of missionaries would bring disorder into the neophyte establishments. I have in consequence not urged the immediate retirement of Fr. Sarriá, until a sufficient number of other missionaries can take the places of those who are to leave the republic, and of those who by reason of old age and infirmity deserve to be relieved of their charges." [31]

Fr. Sarriá offered to leave the country for the Sandwich

---

[30] Fr. Soria to Fr. González Rúbio, September 17th, 1843. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[31] Echeandía to Arizpe, November 4th, 1828. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 215-216; August 11th, 1829. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Sacramento, x, 449-456.

Islands in order to preach the Gospel to the Kanaks and thus relieve the governor of his embarrassment; but these far-off islands were too near California to satisfy the would-be statesmen of Mexico. The government rejected the proposition, and instead directed Echeandía to give the proscribed Father his passport for Europe.[32] The governor assured the Minister of Justice that the Fr. Prefect should be put on board the first ship bound for Europe or the United States.[33] On June 7th, 1829, however, Echeandía again defended his inaction in this matter by showing that all the missionaries save three were Spaniards, and that it was manifestly impossible to expel the friars as long as no others were substituted. At the same time he forwarded a list of the Fathers showing the condition and age of each one. First he gave the names of all the Spaniards in the territory subject to expulsion in virtue of the law of December 20th, 1827, already mentioned. Altogether, according to the returns, there were only seventeen males of Spanish birth in Lower California and fewer than forty among the military in Upper California.[34] The governor then gives the names of the Spanish friars as follows:

Fr. Gerónimo Boscana; age fifty-three years and disposed to swear allegiance.

Fr. Vicente Oliva; forty-nine years and ten months old; robust health; refused to take oath in 1826.

Fr. Antonio Peiri; infirm; seventy years of age; took the oath in 1826 willingly; his attachment for our institutions and the good condition of his mission recommend this religious.

Fr. José Barona; age sixty-six years; broken in health; decided to take the oath in 1826 as far as is compatible with

---

[32] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap. xix, 497-498; Dep. Rec. vi, 158; 215-216.

[33] Echeandía to Minister of Justice, June 30th, 1828. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 221.

[34] Echeandía to the Minister of Justice, August 11th, 1829. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Sacramento, x, 449-456; Dep. Rec. vi, 235-241; vii, 149-156; 191-196.

his religious profession, and as long as he remained in the Mexican Republic.

Fr. José Maria de Zalvidea; forty-nine years of age; broken in health; in 1826 he made the same avowal as Fr. Barona.

Fr. José Bernardo Sánchez; fifty-one years; of the same opinion with Fr. Zalvidea.

Fr. Francisco Ibarra; forty-eight years of age; he shares the sentiments of Fr. Sánchez.

Fr. Francisco Suñer; seventy-one years old; blind; took the oath in 1826.

Fr. Blas Ordáz; thirty-eight years of age and in good health; in 1826 he first agreed to swear, but then refused, and regards it an honor that he would not take an oath to the prejudice of his sovereign.

Fr. Marcos de Vitoria; aged sixty-nine years; in broken health; in 1826 at first agreed to swear, but then retracted, yet he is willing to obey the authorities. It is to an excessive respect for his prelates, one can say, that he changed his mind. His orderly life and exemplary virtue recommend him; his illness and advanced age should be taken into consideration so that he may remain here.

Fr. Antonio Jaime; seventy-two years of age; ill health. In 1827 he took the oath with the restrictive clause like other Franciscans.

Fr. Felipe Arroyo de la Cuesta; forty-nine years old; he took the oath in 1826, but now claims loyalty to the King of Spain.

Fr. Buenaventura Fortuni; age fifty-six years; broken in health; declined to swear in 1826, but declared he would obey the authorities.

Fr. Ramón Abella; sixty-five years old; infirm; thinks like Fr. Fortuni.

Fr. Francisco Xavier Uría; fifty-nine years of age; fair health; declined to swear in 1826, and is consequently subject to the penalty; but his good services recommend him.

Fr. Pedro Cabot; forty-nine years old; good health and of strict religious conduct; refused to take the oath because he

FR. JUAN CABOT IN VIEW OF TULARES VALLEY. (See pp. 22-24.)

had sworn fidelity to Fernando VII., but he will obey the authorities.

Fr. Juan Bautista Sancho; fifty-seven years of age; health not good; agrees with Fr. Cabot.

Fr. Juan Cabot; forty-nine years and nine months old; poor health; would not swear in 1826.

Fr. Juan Amorós; age fifty-six years; good health; promises to obey any government under which he lives.

Fr. Tomás Esténaga; forty-five years of age; poor health; in 1826 he positively declared that he could not take the oath in conscience, but would obey the government.

Fr. Magín Catalá; sixty-eight years old; in poor health; declined to take the oath, but promises to obey the authorities.

Fr. José Viader; age sixty-four years and eight months; broken health; of strict religious observance; would not take the oath, but promises obedience.

Fr. Narciso Durán, age fifty-two years and eleven months; good health; he declined to swear allegiance.

Fr. Juan Moreno; thirty years old; good health; arrived in 1827; he has given no reason to be suspected of enmity to the government.[35]

Fr. Vicente de Sarriá, sixty-two years old, does not appear on Echeandía's list, probably because he was marked for expulsion. Fr. Luis Antonio Martínez, fifty-eight years of age, Fr. Fernando Martin, fifty-nine years old, and Fr. Luis Gil y Taboada, fifty-six years of age and infirm, were also omitted. They all had refused to take an unconditional oath. Besides these twenty-eight Spanish friars, there were two young Mexican Fathers in the territory, Fr. José Joaquín Jimeno and Fr. Antonio Jimeno, who had arrived in 1827.[36]

Three weeks after sending his list to Mexico, Echeandía asked the Mexican Minister of Foreign and Internal Rela-

---

[35] Echeandía to Ministro de Relaciones, June 7th, 1829. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vii, 149-155; 665-666. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 1821-1824; 1827.

[36] Fr. Moreno, for having entered the Order in Mexico, was also regarded as a Mexican. Fr. Cortés to Fr. Durán, May 31st, 1827; Fr. Sánchez, "Informe Bienal," March 20th, 1828.

tions to permit all the missionaries enumerated to stay at their post except Fathers Arroyo, Ordáz, the two Cabot brothers, Sancho, Ibárra, Oliva, Durán, Esténaga, Abella, and Uria. These should be given the passports for which they clamored. At the same time he wrote:

"By all means Fathers Peiri, Jayme, Barona, and Suñer should stay along with the others for whom I ask this permission on account of their age, infirmities, and virtue; for



Signature of Fr. José Barona.

of those in behalf of whom I ask the permit to stay only two or three will be able to manage the mission temporalities for some time to come. The rest are not able, or will serve only if they cannot avoid it. Thus they will be of use at their missions only in spiritual matters."

In the same report Echeandía also states the reasons why the said Spanish Fathers should not be expelled: "There are twenty-one missions, but only three Mexican friars; the others are Spaniards, who by their industry have placed the missions in a state of actual wealth. If unhappily the missions should be deprived of these Fathers we should see the population in a lamentable condition for want of subsistence. The neophytes would give themselves to idleness and pillage and other disorders which would ruin the missions, and they would resume the savage life from which the greater number or nearly all have come; then, after they have settled down in the mountains, all agricultural and mechanical industry would cease, and the rest of the inhabitants and troops would perish." [37] Echeandía goes on to show that

[37] "Que si por desgracia ahora quedarian las misiones sin padres, se veria un estado lamentable de población y medios de subsistencia; que los neófitos entrarian en ociosidad y pillaje y otras

the territory would be without spiritual food over a stretch of country more than two hundred leagues in length for which the three Mexican Fathers would not suffice. He expresses his belief that the decadence of Lower California resulted from the lack of religious who could manage the temporal and spiritual affairs of the missions, and that in Upper California decay is already noticed on account of the infirmities of the missionaries. He therefore urges the government not to insist on expulsion until Mexican Fathers could take the places of the Spanish Fathers. For the same reason Fr. Luis Martínez should not have his passport.[38]

Before the governor's appeal reached the capital the federal government more strongly manifested its bitterness against the mother country by decreeing, on March 20th, 1829, that all Spaniards residing in California, New Mexico, and other northern territories should leave the country within one month and the republic within three months after the publication of the law.[39] Governor Echeandía published the iniquitous measure on July 6th;[40] "but, in accordance with his previously expressed opinion," says Hittell, "he had little expectation that it could be, or in fact ought to be, any more rigidly enforced than the other. There was in fact, among the people, a very strong opposition to it in so far as it affected the missionaries, and especially those that had taken the oath. In the pueblo of San José this feeling was apparently unanimous. The ayuntamiento or town council of that place met on August 25th, 1829, and in the name

---

desgracias que arruinarian las misiones, y se volverian á la vida salvaje de donde la mayor parte ó casi todos tienen su principio; y que remontados en las sierras se acabaria toda industria agricola y fabril, y pereceria la demas gente y tropa." For once Echeandía spoke justly about the value of the missions for the commonwealth.

[38] Echeandía al Ministro de Relaciones, June 30th, 1829. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vii, 155-167.

[39] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., San José, ii, 149-150.

[40] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. ii, 334-336; Dep. St. Pap., San José, ii, 149-150; Argüello to Echeandía, August 6th, 1829. "Archb Arch.," no. 2062.

of the whole people protested against its execution. At the same time they implored the governor to use his influence to procure such a modification of its terms that the missionaries, upon whom the country depended for spiritual consolation, and many worthy citizens, who formed an important part of their too small population, might be excepted from its operation.[41] It was apparent that there would be very great difficulty in attempting to carry out either the letter or the spirit of the law; and during Echeandía's administration, with the exception of expelling a few persons of little consideration, nothing of importance was done in relation to it."[42] No distinction seems to have been made in favor of those who had taken the oath, so that the friars would have sworn in vain had they complied. They were Spaniards; that was their only crime; therefore they would have to depart, oath or no oath. Truly the Mexicans in power had a singular conception of liberty!

The town council of Monterey went further than the ayuntamiento of San José. On September 22nd, it addressed a long protest directly to the President of Mexico. The chief points of this document read as follows: "Most Illustrious Sir—The Ayuntamiento of this port in the name of the whole community addresses itself to Your Excellency in order to place before you with candor the spiritual desolation to which it will be reduced if—what is incredible—the expulsion of the missionary Fathers is carried out. It implores your piety that, as first magistrate of such a Christian republic, you cast a compassionate glance at our unhappy condition and provide a suitable remedy. This territory, Most Excellent Sir, receives its spiritual nourishment from

---

[41] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. ii, 361-362; Missions & Colonization ii, 16-18. In reply to the petition from San José, Echeandía wrote to the alcalde on October 22nd, 1829, that he would refer the protest to the government notwithstanding that he had already petitioned to the same effect himself. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vii, 820-821.

[42] Hittell, ii, 87-88.

the missionary Fathers of these missions. There are twenty-one situated along a stretch of more than two hundred leagues, and there are twenty-eight missionaries [43] of whom twenty-five are Spaniards. Besides the missions, they are in charge of the souls in four presidios with their adjoining settlers, of three pueblos and a considerable number of ranchos scattered throughout the territory. If the government should fully execute aforesaid law, in this vast territory only three religious would remain to attend to the spiritual needs of its inhabitants. . . . This ayuntamiento shudders when it contemplates the bereavement in which the inhabitants would be left without the meritorious laborers of the Gospel, who until now have broken to them the word of God and assisted them in all their spiritual needs with a truly apostolic zeal, in case they should be separated from their flock. . . . This ayuntamiento cannot convince itself that the Supreme Government, which watches so much over the happiness of its subjects, should overlook the foundation, which is the preservation of our beloved Religion, and should leave this country without a proportionate number of priests.

"This ayuntamiento faithfully observes our wise Constitution and punctually obeys the laws, but it believes that it would fail of its duty, if it passed over in silence the eminent merit won by the Spanish religious and missionaries who are at present in the territory and discharge their obligations. As men, truly apostolic, they have continually given us an example of most eminent virtues; and inasmuch as their civil conduct has been so peaceful, and they are the first in obedience to the laws,[44] it is but right that this ayuntamiento should regard itself bound to beseech the Supreme Government to urge congress to make an exception in favor of said religious. . . .

---

[43] Rather thirty, though one died three months later.

[44] "Hombres verdaderamente apostólicos, nos han dado continuos exemplos de las mas eminentes virtudes; y como por otra parte su conducta politica ha sido tan pacifica, siendo los primeros en dar obediencia á las leyes, etc."

"There also dwell among us a small number of married Spaniards, honorable neighbors, good husbands and kind fathers, who have merited consideration through their peaceful conduct. It would be very painful to this ayuntamiento to see their innocent and large families abandoned to misery and subjected to hardships on account of the misdeeds which some wayward Spaniards in different parts of the republic may have committed, etc. Port of Monterey, September 22nd, 1829. José Tibúrcio Castro, Francisco Soria, Feliciano Soberanes, Santiago Moreno, and José Antonio Gajiola, secretary." [45]

No action seems to have been taken on this and similar petitions; but Henry Virmond, a German merchant who did a thriving trade with California, wrote from Mexico on October 12th, 1829, that the President had not the slightest intention of expelling the friars from California.[46] Nevertheless, the government had endeavored to find Mexican substitutes after it had received the report of the hasty departure of Fathers Altimira and Ripoll; for on the same day on which the decree of expulsion was issued, March 20th, 1829, Minister Canedo wrote to Echeandía "that the Apostolic College of Zacatecas would replace the fugitives with other friars." [47]

One of the proscribed missionaries, good Fr. Antonio Jaime, who for years had been crippled from rheumatism and old age, passed beyond the reach of scheming politicians by dying a peaceful death at Santa Barbara on December 2nd, 1829.[48] Other Fathers, like Boscana and Sánchez of San Gabriel, after the publication of the decree promptly demanded their

---

[45] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Missions and Colon., ii, 15-18.

[46] Bancroft, iii, 97; Fr. Cortés, "Carta," May 31st, 1827. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[47] "El Colegio Apostólico de Zacatecas proveerá á reemplazarlos." Canedo to Echeandía, March 20th, 1829. "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap., Decr. and Desp., iv, 184-186.

[48] Santa Barbara Mission Record.

passports from the governor only to be refused.[49] Fr. Peiri, who besides the blind Fr. Suñer, was the only missionary who had enthusiastically sworn allegiance to the unstable government, and who had even adopted the official phrase *Dios y Libertad* in signing his letters, felt so deeply chagrined that he wanted to leave without delay before he became incapacitated for the long voyage to Spain by reason of his advanced age. The governor replied that he had asked the federal government to make an exception in his favor, and therefore could not issue a passport. The next day Fr. Peiri again called for his passport, because he wanted to end his days in his native country. Echeandía declared that he would not grant a permit for the departure until a substitute had arrived.[50] Yet, at this very time, the governor was deliberating how he could remove from the territory the venerable Fr. Luis Martínez of San Luis Obispo without waiting for a substitute, as we shall see in the next chapter.

Before proceeding we have yet to note that the governor, early in October 1829, officially notified Fr. Presidente Sánchez that a new Pope had been elected on March 31st, and had taken the name Pius VIII. Fr. Sánchez on October 11th replied that a High Mass and Te Deum would be sung in honor of the event, and the usual solemnities would be observed which Bishop Rouset had prescribed[51] on occasion of the election of Pius VII., and which had also taken place on the elevation of Pope Leo XII.[52] Fr. Tomas Mansilla, Superior of the Dominican Missions in Lower California,

---

[49] Fr. Boscana to Echeandía, July 12th; Fr. Sánchez to Echeandía, July 22nd, 1829. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 2061; 2064. Evidently the friars were not clinging to the mission property, as Bancroft, Hittell, and Co., insist, otherwise they would have kept silent.

[50] Fr. Peiri to Echeandía, August 29th; Echeandía to Fr. Peiri, September 22nd; Fr. Peiri to Echeandía, September 25th; Echeandía to Fr. Peiri, September 26th, 1829. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vii, 783; 786; "Archb. Arch.," nos. 2068; 2070.

[51] Bishop Rouset to Fr. Lasuén, September 19th, 1800. "Libro de Patentes" of the various missions.

[52] Fr. Sánchez to Echeandía. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2072.

described the celebrations seen at San Diego in a letter to Echeandía. There was a Solemn High Mass and Te Deum on three consecutive days, bells were sounded, and for three nights after the Poor Souls' Bell the church portals were illuminated.[53]

[53] Fr. Mansilla, O. P., to Echeandía, November 2nd, 1829. He signs "Dios y Libertad. Puerto de San Diego." "Archb. Arch.," no. 2075.

CHAPTER XVII.

Fr. Luis Martínez.—Offends Echeandía and the Paisanos.—The Solís Revolt.—"Bravery" of the Paisanos.—Bancroft on Fr. Martínez.—Echeandía in Search of a Pretext.—Fr. Martínez Arrested.—Imprisoned.—Echeandía's Motives.—Fr. Sarriá's Defense of Fr. Martínez.—Sad State of the Missions.—Echeandía's Hypocrisy.—His Impertinence.—Rebuked.—Shameless Treatment of Fr. Martínez.—Mrs. Ord's Narrative.

FR. LUIS MARTÍNEZ, since June 1798 missionary at San Luis Obispo, at his request had received his passport, but on the advice of Fr. Sarriá he delayed the departure for the sake of the poor neophyte Indians.[1] He was a most energetic manager of the mission temporalities as well as a zealous missionary. At the same time he was noted as a confirmed wag, whose practical jokes caused much merriment among the frequently disheartened missionaries and the Spaniards generally. No one was surprised or offended at anything the jovial friar of San Luis Obispo was pleased to say or do, if we except the pompous young Californians; for the good Father in his merriest mood would never overstep the bounds of priestly dignity. Even Bancroft acknowledges that Fr. Martínez "never scandalized his Order by irregular or immoral conduct."[2]

He was on especially intimate terms with Captain José de la Guerra of Santa Barbara, the síndico of the California friars since the declaration of Mexican independence. In the De la Guerra Collection there are still found one hundred and nineteen letters addressed to his military friend.[3] In nearly all he fairly bubbles over with humor and wit. Some-

---

[1] Echeandía to the government, December 6th, 1828. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vi, 235-241.

[2] "History of California," ii, 619.

[3] Many of his official letters, more lengthy and orderly, and also dated properly, are preserved in the Santa Barbara and the Archbishop's archives.

times he would branch out on the atheistic movements of the Mexican politicians. His sarcasm then was inimitable. It is often difficult to say what predominated, whether he was giving way to indignation or just poking fun because of the irreligious proceedings in both Mexico and California. Yet Fr. Martínez would waste no paper, nor burden the mail-carrier; for his missives were mostly scrawled on scraps not wider than two or three and not longer than seven inches. Dates with him were superfluous. Hence it is difficult to fix the month or year except in connection with some allusion to a contemporary episode. His signature, too, seemed to him a waste of time for all that we find to indicate his name is Fr. Luis Mrnz., or Fr. Mrnz. only.

Such was the missionary of San Luis Obispo during the first three decades of the nineteenth century. Unfortunately for himself, considering the troublous period, Fr. Martínez spoke as candidly as he wrote or thought; nor did it seem to make any difference to him who was present. Thus it was that evil-minded persons reported his caustic remarks about the schoolboy attempts at government on the part of such overgrown youths as Vallejo, Alvarado, and others. This touched the young *paisanos* in a sore spot. Most probably the talebearers, who had no respect for age or dignity, would exaggerate or manufacture what they reported. The result was that the guileless Father incurred the wrath of the conceited would-be statesmen, scarcely out of their teens, and they in turn would inform the governor. The latter, who seems to have inaugurated a regular spy system against the Fathers,[4] only waited for an opportunity to make the obnoxious friar feel his power.

---

[4] "Nos ha resultado el peligro inminente de ser tratados con la maior arbitrariedad y vilipendio por parte de dicho Señor Comandante General (Echeandía) á la menor palabra descuidada, aunque muy verdadera, reportada por algun ingrato de los muchos que diariamente disfrutan de nuestra hospitalidad."—"We are in imminent danger of being treated most arbitrarily and disdainfully by the governor for the least unguarded word, although it be very true, reported by some ingrate among many who daily enjoy our hospitality." Fr. Durán to the Mexican President, May 10th, 1830. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

What steps Echeandía took may be learned from a letter addressed to him by Lieutenant José Fernández del Campo of Monterey on October 22nd, 1829. "I have made some investigations in the matter which Your Honor entrusted to me in your official communication of September 9th, and which was marked 'confidential,' among persons capable of keeping a secret, and they all suspect Fr. Luis Martínez, missionary of San Luis Obispo; but they give not a single convincing proof that could be of weight in court, as all declare that they had heard it said, but not to whom or how. As far as I am concerned, I can say to Your Honor that when I was leaving your presidio for this one, I suffered from the said Father a serious grievance, inasmuch as in his conversations he in very sarcastic terms boldly ridiculed our independence and liberty, and finished his insults by lodging me in a room in the ceiling of which could be read this inscription: *V. F. 7.*[5] I made some efforts to erase it with the point of my sword, but it was impossible on account of the height. I regret that *to all this there is no other witness than myself.*"[6]

Some other dreamer must have hoaxed the willing governor; for he on October 7th, 1829, reported to the Minister of Justice "that he had given orders to the presidio commanders to find out who the missionaries were one of whom kept two candles burning every day before the portrait of Fernando VII., and the other preached that the same Fernando would return and again rule over Mexico, and would be received with open arms."[7] Of course the investigation brought out nothing or Echeandía would not have remained silent.

An abortive revolt which occurred a few weeks later afforded the angry governor a wretched excuse to proceed

[5] "Viva Fernando VII."! as they interpreted it, if it was there at all. An investigation on the spot might have verified or disproved the accusation. Campo might have called in others to examine the alleged writing. Neither action was taken.

[6] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap. x, 394-397. The italics are ours.

[7] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vii, 243.

against Fr. Martínez. During the night of November 12-13th discontented soldiers at Monterey rebelled, imprisoned the officers and territorial officials, and took possession of the presidio. Juan Solís, an ex-convict, who lived on a ranch near the port, was chosen leader of the revolt. This was directed chiefly against Echeandía whom they blamed for not receiving their pay. The rebels marched to the presidio of San Francisco where a number of troops joined the rabble. From there they proceeded down the country and past the missions as far as Santa Barbara, where a "battle" was fought which Dr. Stephen Anderson, a Scotch physician, describes thus to Captain Cooper of Monterey: "You would have laughed had you been here when the gentlemen from your quarter made their appearance. All the people moved from the presidio, except thirty women, who went bag and baggage on board the *Funchal*. The two parties were in sight of each other for nearly two days, and exchanged shots, but at such a distance that there was no chance of my assistance being needed. About thirty have passed over to this side.[8] The general[9] appears to be perplexed what to do. He seems as much frightened as ever."[10]

"The cannon balls discharged from the presidio upon the enemy were discharged with so little force that persons arrested them in their course, without sustaining any injury by so doing, at the point where in the common order of things they must have inflicted death."[11]

When Solís had expended his ammunition and consumed the provisions he beat a hasty retreat. He was pursued, but not at close quarters. Many deserted him on the road, and Solís with a small band was captured at Monterey. After a trial he was with some of his dupes sent in irons to Mexico,

[8] That is to say, so many accepted the pardon which Echeandía, January 7th, 1830, had offered in a proclamation.

[9] Echeandía himself. That class of patriots are usually very brave when facing helpless monks and nuns. In serious action they are "as frightened as ever."

[10] Bancroft, iii, 81.

[11] Pattie, "Personal Narrative," p. 225, Thwaites's reprint, p. 293.

along with Herrera whom the governor cordially hated. The government set the prisoners free and returned Herrera to occupy his former office of commissary.[12] Thus the "battle" in which for the first time Californians were pitted against Californians so-called, was fought. Real bravery evidently was not one of the qualities of those *paisanos,* though they would look fierce in the presence of women and children, and though they would put on martial airs when there was question of overawing defenceless priests and unarmed Indians. Their appearance and conduct in real action must have excited the ridicule of others, but they wisely held their tongue. This, it seems, the honest Fr. Martínez forgot to do, and so he occasionally manifested his disdain. For that reason the vindictive Echeandía and his young adherents utilized this very Solís fiasco to remove the missionary from the country of which he had deserved so well.

"I have said," Bancroft informs us, "that Echeandía deemed it desirable to get rid of certain padres. Personal feeling was his motive in part; moreover, it was important to remove certain obstacles likely to interfere with his policy of secularization. Prejudice against all that was Spanish was the strongest feeling in Mexico, and there was no better way for the governor to keep himself in good standing with the power that appointed him than to go with the current. It also favored Echeandía's plans to show the existence of a strong revolutionary spirit in favor of Spain. There was, however, but a slight foundation on which to build. The padres were Spaniards, and as a rule disapproved the new form of government; but it is not likely that any of them had a definite hope of overthrowing the republic, or of restoring California to the old system, and the most serious charge that could be justly brought against them was an occasional injudicious use of the tongue.

"Of all the padres Fr. Martínez of San Luis Obispo was the most outspoken and independent in political matters. Echeandía deemed his absence desirable, and it was thought

[12] Bancroft, iii, 68-85. For Solís's "Manifiesto" of November 15th, 1829, see "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. ii, 384-390.

best on general principles to make an example. It was particularly desirable to give a political significance to the Solís revolt, and Padre Martínez was banished on a charge of complicity in that revolt in the interest of Spain. The *evidence against him was not very strong;* [13] *but there was little risk,* since as a Spaniard the accused might at any time be legally exiled."[14]

Some excuse was necessary for proceeding against the old missionary. Trusted officers and privates, therefore, seem to have been instructed to unearth some plea under which an arrest might be justified before the public. Lieutenant Romualdo Pacheco, for instance, on January 27th, 1830, gratified the governor with this report from San Luis Obispo: "On my arrival here the missionary Father of this mission communicated to me that two or three days before he had received from Joaquin Solís a letter, along with another which he had forwarded to the missionary Fathers of Purisima and Santa Inés; that therein he was asked to instruct the neophytes of his mission in the use of fire-arms in order that they might assist in upholding the Spanish flag, which would be unfurled as soon as he arrived at the Rancho Nacional near Monterey; that he had returned said letter, together with others, through Martin Olivera, mayordomo of Mission San Miguel; that he had replied as he was bound to reply;[15] and that he knew that a similar proposal had been made to the Father of said mission (San Miguel), Fr. Juan Cabot."[16]

Here was something Echeandía pretended to believe indicated complicity, because it showed that Solís and Fr. Martínez must be on friendly terms, though the Father had refused to assist the rebel. Unfortunately for the governor, two other missionaries had received similar undesirable missives and proposals. All three could not be arrested. He

---

[13] Bancroft should have said "was very flimsy," especially as he himself shows that "some of the items rested on the statement of a single soldier," and others were founded on hearsay.

[14] Bancroft, iii, 97-98. The italics are ours.

[15] That is to say, he had to decline and therefore declined.

[16] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Missions ii, 91-93.

merely wanted to reach Fr. Martínez. For the time being Echeandía accordingly suspended aggressive action. A few days later, February 1st, Corporal Bernardo Curiel, a Mexican youth of eighteen years, at last supplied the desired pretext by charging Fr. Martínez with having offered to assist Solís with money, and with having exclaimed, "Go to, with your republic" [17] when some had shouted, "Viva la Republica!"[18]

This story of the henchman supplied the unscrupulous governor with the pretext he had sought for taking action against the venerable missionary of San Luis Obispo. After all there was no court in the territory to issue an injunction and examine into the merits of the case. As for the Mexican Government, Echeandía knew very well it would not favor a Spanish priest.

Another motive seems to have urged the wily official to hasten proceedings, as it was doubtful that a better opportunity would arise to rid himself of the fearless friar. Echeandía even then, as will appear later, was big with a scheme which aimed at nothing less than the removal of the missionaries from the administration of the mission temporalities. Fr. Martínez's violent arrest and subsequent banishment from the country would strike such terror into the hearts of the friars and their friends that they would hardly dare oppose his plans. At all events, he would make the attempt, and so began by venting his spleen on the aged Fr. Martínez. On February 3rd he issued the warrant for the apprehension of the missionary on the ground of having instigated a proclamation in behalf of Spain,[19] and three days later he commanded Lieutenant Miguel García Lobato to pro-

---

[17] "Reniego de tu Republica."

[18] "Solís Proceso."—"Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Benicia, Military, lxxii.

[19] "Se ponga en seguridad á P. Luis Martínez por instigar á pronunciamento por España."—"Solís Proceso."

VIOLENT ARREST OF FR. LUIS A. MARTÍNEZ, SAN LUIS OBISPO, FEBRUARY, 1830.

ceed to San Luis Obispo with a body of men and to bring Fr. Martínez to Santa Barbara as a prisoner.[20]

This proceeding was altogether unnecessary, as a simple notice that he was wanted at the presidio would have brought the worthy missionary to the presence of the governor. Thus a most distressing scene and public scandal would have been avoided; but that was just what Echeandía wanted. He intended to impress the Indians with his superiority and power over the missionary. Lobato knew his master's mind, and therefore carried out his orders with all the military bustle and brutality of which unscrupulous officials and sycophants are capable.[21] Naturally the poor Indians gasped at the sacrilegious seizure and removal of their spiritual guide. They were overawed indeed; but not so the friars. If they staid at their post, instead of leaving the country forthwith, it was because the fate of their neophytes detained them, as will become evident shortly.

Lobato was instructed "not to permit Fr. Martínez to issue any protest lest public tranquillity be disturbed, because the prestige which all the missionaries enjoyed is well known."[22] At Santa Barbara the venerable friar was lodged in the mission where Fr. Antonio Jimeno treated him with all the respect due him, and moreover allowed him to exercise his ministry as though he were a visitor and not a prisoner.[23]

When Fr. Commissary Vicente de Sarriá learned what had occurred he at once addressed Echeandía in his usual gentle and courteous manner, though a vigorous protest and concerted action on the part of all the Fathers would certainly have impressed the overbearing official more effectively. "As

[20] "Con anterioridad ha tomado providencia para el aseguramiento del P. Martínez; estrechará sus ordines sobre el asunto."—"Solís Proceso."

[21] Fr. Durán to the President of Mexico, May 10th, 1830. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[22] "No tome declaracion al P. Martínez, para no alterar la tranquilidad publica; por que es sabido el prestigio que gozan todos los misioneros." "Solís Proceso."

[23] Fr. Antonio to Echeandía, February 25th, 1830. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2086.

Your Honor may well understand my life has been reduced to making compromises. So it is also with regard to what is now taking place. At present I find myself in the most critical dilemma of spirit on account of the attention the affair demands and the difficulties to which it subjects me. Ever since Lieutenant Romualdo Pacheco [24] complained to me I had a presentiment of Fr. Martínez's retirement.[25] I spoke at some length with him about the said Father, and moreover wrote to Monterey to him from this mission [26] on the same subject. I beg Your Honor not to take it ill if I now place before your superior consideration some things involved in the case.

"Passing over what may have been reported against the Father, which talk I from experience know is of no value especially in this country, what I can say is that Fr. Luis Martínez gave positive proof that he had strongly opposed the Solís revolt. I myself can solemnly affirm this. One of the soldiers whom the said Solís could not induce to join him was Corporal José Maria Villa. When the latter was with me at this mission, he assured me that Fr. Martínez had encouraged him in his sentiments not to go over to Solís.[27] When Solís was on his way from San Luis Obispo to Santa Barbara he wrote to Fr. Martínez to allow his mission to favor him with some horses and mules, and to contribute $200. The Father refused.[28] Romualdo Pacheco complained to me that Fr. Martínez was somewhat remiss in aiding the troops when he passed through the mission;[29] but I understand that Fr. Martínez was then so ill that on the following

---

[24] See note 29 this chapter.

[25] Very gently expressed for "the predetermined exile of Fr. Martínez," as he might have written.

[26] Soledád, where Fr. Sarriá resided.

[27] "que le habia apoyado y continuado en aquellos sentimientos de no rendirse á Solís el P. Martínez."

[28] "El Padre se lo negó."

[29] This Pacheco had come to California with Echeandía. As acting comandante he was among those who distinguished themselves in the famous "battle" with Solís described before.

Sunday or holyday he could not celebrate holy Mass, and the neophytes were left to themselves.[30]

"The condition in which we missionaries find ourselves is deplorable already and it is turning into desolation. Fr. Juan Bautista Sancho has died,[31] and Fr. Magin Catalá, missionary of Santa Clara, has received Extreme Unction.[32] At Mission San Juan Bautista the missionary Father is so incapacitated that, when there is necessity of hearing a confession or of administering Extreme Unction in the Indian village, he has to be borne there on a stretcher.[33] Even so he cannot visit the outside ranchos, so that I have at times attended his sick."[34]

The good Father Comisario-Prefecto might as well have left his vindication of Fr. Martínez and his touching appeal unwritten, if he expected to move a man who had already made up his mind. In reply Echeandía wrote from Santa Barbara hypocritically: "I assure you I am deeply afflicted that Fr. Luis Martínez should prove an accomplice, at least, in a crime against the whole nation.[35] Respecting him as I do every priest, I have merely deported him from the place

---

[30] "Se halló el Padre algo enfermo por entonces, ni aun dijo la Misa por lo mismo, segun he oido, el Domingo ó Fiesta siguiente, y dejados por si los neofitos."

[31] February 8th, 1830, at San Antonio; Fr. Jaime had passed away only two months earlier at Santa Barbara.

[32] He lingered on till November 22nd; but Fr. F. X. Uría of San Buenaventura was on February 6th declared in a critical condition by Dr. Anderson. Fathers Boscana, Suñer, and Barona died in the next year, and no substitutes could be expected from anywhere!

[33] "que si se ofrece confesar ó dar Extrema Uncion en la rancheria de su mision, le han de llevar en algun artificio; pero ni aun asi está para ir á administrar á fuera á los ranchos." This was Fr. Arroyo.

[34] From Sodedád! Fr. Sarriá himself was an old man! Fr. Sarriá to Echeandía, February 9th, 1830. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2083.

[35] The Mexican Government did not think so in the case of Solís, the ringleader, for it released him and soon gave Echeandía a successor. The revolt had been against Echeandía alone. Much less then could Fr. Martínez have committed a crime against the nation.

in which he possessed universal influence; but he is treated at the mission [36] with the honor coming to him, and he enjoys the greatest comfort and liberty. I believe that in the end he will use his passport if greater damage to the country shall not result."[37]

Eleven days later, however, Echeandía changed his mind and determined to deprive Fr. Martínez at once of what liberty he enjoyed. "Your Reverence knows," he wrote to Fr. Antonio Jimeno who had gone on a visit to Mission Santa Inés, "that Fr. Luis Martínez is considered a prisoner, and consequently the mission in your charge is abandoned and will remain so entirely, now that we are about to take steps which will bring him to his destination.[38] Hence, if Your Reverence do not immediately return to the mission in your charge, you will be responsible for the damage which may result against the service of the nation by reason of your absence.[39] Owing to the friendship which we must maintain, I do not treat this matter officially, but as confidential."[40]

In this communication Echeandía assumed a right which he did not possess. It was the duty of the Fr. Commissary or of the Fr. Presidente to admonish a friar under penalty as to his priestly obligations. In ecclesiastical matters the Fathers owed no obedience to the governor. Moreover, he could easily prevent the damage to which he referred by allowing Fr. Martínez to stay at the mission, and exercise priestly functions in the absence or in the presence of Fr. Jimeno until his case had been decided. There was no need of locking Fr. Martínez up at the presidio like a criminal to the scandal of

---

[36] Santa Barbara.

[37] Echeandía to Fr. Sarriá, February 13th, 1830. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2084. The governor consequently had already decreed Fr. Martínez's fate.

[38] "ahora que se va á proceder para que tome ó siga á su destino." Hence Echeandía had already decreed his exile. The subsequent court-martial was therefore a farcical matter of form.

[39] Echeandía did not scruple to leave San Luis Obispo orphaned!

[40] Echeandía to Fr. Jiméno, February 24th, 1830. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2085.

the neophytes. He might have left Fr. Martínez at his own mission of San Luis Obispo for the same reason. The damage done there was all due to the spite of Echeandía, as that mission for a long time after could not be supplied with a priest. Then to assert that the Father would be guilty of treason unless he obeyed Echeandía's whims in matters that did not concern the governor, shows what an overweening opinion he had of himself and what a low estimate he placed upon the priestly character. He deserved a rebuke, and Fr. Jimeno administered it. "The mission," he wrote in reply to the impertinent missive of Echeandía, "has not been abandoned, as Your Honor would make me believe. With regard



Signature of Fr. Antonio Jiméno.

to spiritual things Fr. Luis has taken my place, and he is as much a priest as I am wherever he may be. As to temporal affairs, the mayordomo and the alcaldes have been instructed in what they have to do."[41]

Fr. Martínez was accordingly removed, imprisoned in the house of Captain José de la Guerra, and put in charge of Lobato who certainly failed to treat the missionary "with the respect coming to him," as Echeandía asserted. Mrs. Ord in her "Ocurrencias" [42] relates that "Fr. Luis Martínez was treated with no respect or consideration whatever, for when apprehended he was not given sufficient time to take a handkerchief along.[43] He was placed in a room of the *comandancia* where Echeandía and comandante Pacheco had their quarters, and kept *incomunicado*.[44] The only person with

[41] Fr. Antonio Jiméno to Echeandía, February 25th, 1830. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2086. Fr. Antonio was a native of the City of Mexico.

[42] Mrs. Ord was the daughter of José de la Guerra.

[43] "no se le permitió ni tiempo suficiente para tomar un pañuelo."

[44] in close confinement and forbidden to converse with any one.

whom he exchanged any words was Ramona Carrillo, wife of the said Pacheco, who waited upon him in person. My father was a countryman and intimate friend of Fr. Martínez, but by the strictest kind of regulations it was made impossible for him to see the Father.

"One day," Mrs. Ord continues her simple narrative, "my father said he wished to write Fr. Martínez a note (for it was not permitted to speak to him), and to send him some clothing with other things for his comfort. I told him I would go where the Father was confined, and would try to deliver the note. My father consented, and then gave me the note. I was about fifteen years of age when he entrusted me with this commission. A boy who carried the clothing went with me, and I brought a handkerchief as a gift of my own to the Father. I met the officer of the guard, Alférez Miguel Lobato. I asked him how Fr. Martínez was, and he answered that he was well. Then I asked him whether I could salute the Father for I had always felt much affection for him. He replied that I might see him. I informed him that I wished to cheer the Father with a little handkerchief which I showed. Whilst I gave the Father the handkerchief I touched him with the thumb of my hand and passed the note to him. He quickly understood and put the note in the sleeve of his habit. This took place in the very presence of the official who entered the room with me; but he did not notice it.

"Later the Father was permitted to write a note to my father when he needed anything, but the note had to pass open through the hands of the officer. This officer, Lobato. was extremely harsh with Fr. Martínez.[45] I do not know how long the Father was kept imprisoned, but what is certain is they never allowed him to be at liberty for even a few hours until he left the room to be taken on board the ship. He was led from his prison into a carriage which belonged to my father. When the carriage drove up with Fr. Martínez, my father went to the door to bid a last farewell. As he did so, Fr. Martínez said to him: 'Countryman, Don Miguel Lobato stays to take my place with you. What you would

[45] "Lobato fué el oficial mas duro con el P. Martínez."

have done for me, do it for him.'[46] Lobato was inside the carriage with the prisoner. This was the revenge of the priest whom Lobato had treated so harshly. Then my father said to Lobato, 'You have heard with what my countryman charges me. From this moment I am at your service for anything I can do for you'."[47]

---

[46] "Paisano, queda en mi lugar Don Miguel Lobato. Todo lo que pudiera Vd. hacer por mi, hagalo por el." A truly Christian return for the indignities heaped upon him by Lobato.

[47] "Ya oye Vd. lo que mi paisano encarga, y desde este momento estoy á las ordernes de Vd. para todo aquello en que le pueda servir." Mrs. Ord, "Ocurrencias."

CHAPTER XVIII.

(Continued.)

Echeandía Tries to Find Evidence Against Fr. Martínez.—Letters of Fathers Juan and Pedro Cabot.—Fr. Martínez's Defence and Protest.—A Farcical Court-Martial.—Officers Composing the Court.—Echeandía's Instructions.—Fr. Martínez Banished.—Vallejo's Calumnies.—Attitude of the Missionaries.—The Indians.—Revolt in the North.—Change of Presidente of the Missions.

ECHEANDÍA in the meantime found it necessary to justify his action, and therefore endeavored to procure all the testimony obtainable against Fr. Martínez. Thus on February 16th he elicited from the soldier Alvírez that, though he knew not why the Father was arrested, he heard that Fr. Martínez said "Go to with your Republic." Next day Vicente Cané, an illiterate sailor, who had before given the most absurd testimony against Fathers Juan Cabot, Ripoll and Altimira,[1] claimed that Fr. Martínez showed a writing with the initials "V. F. VII."[2]

On the other hand, it became evident from the testimony of March 5th that Fr. Comisario-Prefecto in a circular had forbidden to furnish the rebels with supplies except the most indispensable. On February 21st Fr. Juan Cabot of Mission San Miguel wrote that, the day before Solís returned from his place to Monterey he asked him to urge Fr. Martínez to arouse the Indians of his mission, after the troops from Santa Barbara had passed by, when he raised the Spanish flag; that he had so written to Fr. Martínez, but that at the same time he had also remarked that we should not meddle with such affairs; that Fr. Martínez had replied: "Tell Solís my ministry is *verbo et opere apostolico*.[3] I will not meddle

[1] See page 246. Cané signed with a cross.

[2] Viva Fernando VII.!

[3] "My ministry has to do with the words and works of the Apostles."

with such things. If the king wants to reconquer America, he must know how to do it himself." Fr. Cabot says that he so reported to Solís, and had added on his own account that he himself was of the same opinion.[4]

Fr. Pedro Cabot of Mission San Antonio wrote to Echeandía on February 27th: "The night before Solís left this mission for Soledád on his retreat from the south, I saw a letter of Fr. Luis Martínez to Solís. In this he wrote noth-



Signature of Fr. Pedro Cabot.

ing more nor less than the following: 'Do not count on me in what you said about the flag. The duties of my apostolic ministry do not permit the carrying out of such plans. If the King of Spain wants to reconquer America, he must know how and when to do it himself.'"[5]

The venerable prisoner meanwhile was growing restless under the indignities. In order to bring the matter to a decision, he on March 4th addressed the following protest and defence to the governor: "Like a sheep led to slaughter I have to this day in obedience to your orders not even opened my lips in just defence against the outrages committed against my person and priestly character; but inasmuch as I observe that unfortunately my religious silence may cause evils of greater consequence, I believe myself forced to break the silence though not without sorrow, because I would scruple very much if my depositions should occasion you any difficulties; for I am far from having any intention of repaying evil with evil.

"Like a criminal, or one guilty of high treason, I was snatched from my peaceful habitation, and dragged hither

[4] Fr. Juan Cabot to Echeandía. "Solís Proceso."

[5] "Solís Proceso."

under a strong guard of soldiers by command of Your Honor. The noisy demonstrations indicated to me, as was to be expected, that the most criminal accusation must have been lodged against my conduct. When I therefore aroused my fortitude to suffer for God the evils which the calumny might bring upon me, a new surprise came to me when I found myself living and eating with Your Honor[6] a good number of days without being in any manner examined as to what I had done.

"No one must be detained without a semi-clear proof or indication that one is guilty, the Constitution of the Mexican Republic ordains in the General Rules on the Administration of Justice, Article 110; and in the following Article it is commanded that he who is detained for suspicion only shall not be held for more than sixty hours. What then must the nature of my crime be which justifies Your Honor to give orders for entering by force without warrant into the house in which I lived, despite the laws of ecclesiastical immunity, and which empowers you to violate the aforesaid Articles? The laws assign to each citizen his respective duties. To depart from them, as in the present case, in order to vex those who live under the protection of the laws, seems to be an offense of unutterable enormity.

"Your Honor knows very well that I am a Spaniard; I do not deny it; but that, without swearing off allegiance to my country or my sovereign, I have remained in the republic through obedience to my Superior from the time of the declaration of independence until the preceding month performing the sublime functions peculiar to my sacred ministry with the same zeal and exactitude of which I have given proof for more than thirty-four years during which I have been in the territory. When in all justice for such reasons I regarded myself well-deserving of a government which I have served in its subjects[7] without the incentive of self-interest; could I have expected, as a reward, that I should be overwhelmed

[6] That is to say, under the same roof at De la Guerra's house.

[7] That is to say, having served the Indians and Mexicans I have served their government.

with insults, and that in place of the passport I had asked for, and for which I in vain appealed to Your Honor, I should have to prepare to proceed to Mexico for the purpose which Your Honor has in view? No, General, I earnestly beg Your Honor to allow reason to triumph in this matter, if not in consideration of my services, at least out of regard for my age of sixty-four years and my well-known serious ailment. I am firmly persuaded that neither my civil nor my religious conduct has given Your Honor any right for your proceedings. Hence it is that, if I were stronger in health, it would please me to give Your Honor one more evidence of my obedience by making the journey which Your Honor intends for me. In that case, however, I should perhaps find myself compelled, for the sake of refuting chimerical reports, to manifest to the Government and to the public by means of the press some things which in reality would not please me to publish.

"I have heard it said that Your Honor has tried to persuade yourself, because it suits you, that the revolt at Monterey had not been caused for the reasons made public in the Solís Plan, but that this was only a pretext to unfurl the Spanish Flag, and that for this reason Your Honor, and perhaps some one else through ignorance or malice, thought that I and some other Fathers would go over to Solís with aid of every kind, induced thereto by that specious cause. Indeed, General, I am not disposed to persuade myself that the good judgment of Your Honor would yield to such a chimerical illusion as would be the least assent given to such a ridiculous story. If Your Honor desired to be guided by the principles of rectitude and justice, you would be the first panegyrist of the loyalty of the Fathers in California, who though they decline to oblige themselves to acknowledge the Republican Government, have nevertheless been faithful observers of its governmental enactments, and have contributed effectively to the support of this territory. In doing this we, I among them, have drained the resources of the missions which have been confided to us, so that their respective neophytes suffered quite noticeable damage. Even though we had given less

convincing proofs of our political submission, how was it possible to suspect us of attempting to contribute, directly or indirectly, to the planting of a government which necessarily would have to terminate in a catastrophe? As soon as it was learned in this territory that Mexico had declared its independence, I was perhaps the first among my brethren (and this is well known) who said: The territory must loyally join its fortunes with the Capital. This was and still is my opinion; and no matter how much of a royalist I may be at heart, never will I assent to the contrary notion; for Spain cannot directly come to the assistance of California, and the latter has not enough means to subsist without assistance.

"As I am not in a position to make any other demands than the said one for my passport to leave the boundaries of the republic in any direction I please in consequence of the outrages which I have suffered, I only desired to give Your Honor in a friendly manner a glimpse of a part of my sentiments. Yet if Your Honor, by doing violence to your kindly character, insist on trampling under foot civil and canon laws by carrying out your view that I must journey to Mexico either by land or sea, I herewith protest against the outrage, and assure you that I will absolutely not submit unless compelled by physical force. I have thought it well to make known to you this state of my mind beforehand, in order to avoid, if possible, the scandal of making resistance which, I assure you, I would not offer did I not suffer from gout which makes it impossible for me to take so long a journey by land."[8]

Echeandía now thought it necessary to give his proceedings a legal aspect, and therefore instituted an examination or trial. The report says "that on March 6th Fr. Martínez chose for his attorney Ignacio Tenorio, who lived forty-one leagues distant. He was told that Tenorio,[9] not being an

[8] Fr. Martínez, "Defensa," in "Solís Proceso."

[9] He was a native of South America, who had been associate judge of the Audiencia of Quito, and a very wealthy man. He had devoted his fortune to charitable and educational purposes, and

official nor a Mexican, could not act as attorney. The prisoner then named Domingo Carrillo, ensign of the presidio. When asked why he was held a prisoner, Fr. Martínez replied, 'On account of a calumny, according to the information received at the time of arrest.' Said calumny is that he tried to induce soldiers to join Solís whom he knows, and who was at his mission while on the way to attack Santa Barbara. He knows through Solís and Piña that they were planning to start a revolt in favor of Spain when they had taken possession of the territory. Fr. Martínez says he tried to dissuade them from this, and from doing wrong by sacrificing the territory in order to avenge an offence against the comisario,[10] for so he believed. The prisoner named as witnesses José M. Villa and José de los Santos Avila, whom he had persuaded and who heard the advice given by him to Raimundo de la Torre.[11] He visited the quarters of Solís, but does not remember having said that he would betray them to Francisquito, their master, if they failed in the undertaking. He knows nothing of a paper with 'Viva Fernando VII.,' written with the three initials. He would make no further declaration until he had the permission of his prelate. He was urged, but in vain."[12]

Mariano G. Vallejo, on the same day, March 6th, testified that Fr. Martínez had refused necessary provisions to the soldiers of the government.[13] The examination was then sus-

---

came to California about 1815 to live with the missionaries. He died in 1831, and was buried at San Juan Capistrano by Fr. Zalvidea, who in the record spoke in high terms of his piety. Bancroft, v, 745.

[10] Herrera, whom Echeandía hated and who was behind Solís.

[11] A corporal implicated with Solís. He was sent to Mexico.

[12] "Solís Proceso."

[13] Vallejo said the same thing of Fr. Viader. They were refused, because no provisions were left, the soldiers having fleeced all the missions out of the most necessary things so that the neophytes were suffering. Vallejo says nothing of this. The preceding pages, however, furnish abundant evidence. He was bitterly hostile to the Fathers, and scrupled not to invent things if the facts could not be made to corroborate his accusations. It is not pleasant to repeat this, but such was Vallejo. See pp. 257-258.

pended because some persons comprised in the trial were absent at Monterey.[14]

"Vallejo tells us," Bancroft remarks in a footnote, "that there were documents proving conclusively that Fr. Martínez was plotting against the republic and carrying on secret correspondence with the rebels in Mexico; but nothing of this kind was shown in the recorded evidence, and the same may be said of a letter of encouragement from Fr. Martínez found on the person of Solís at his capture mentioned by Alvarado."[15]

Echeandía had already intimated what he determined to do with his victim;[16] it therefore mattered not what the witnesses for the defense would testify, or that the evidence for the prosecution was flimsy. The whole proceeding was intended to supply some legal color to the prearranged final action. The governor accordingly convened the so-called court-martial on March 9th. It was composed of Echeandía as presiding judge, Juan José Rocha,[17] Domingo Carrillo, Lieutenant Juan M. Ibarra, Miguel García Lobato,[18] Mariano G. Vallejo,[19] and Captain Agustin V. Zamorano.[20] On this occasion the governor explained that the court was called to conclude the trial interrupted on February 26th; that Fr. Luis Martínez on account of his advanced age and infirmities could not make the journey overland to receive his sentence at the hands of

---

[14] "Solís Proceso."

[15] Bancroft, iii, 98. Vallejo and Alvarado, it appears, could dream at will, and they never seem to have hesitated to proclaim as facts the dreams which merely demonstrated the extent of the malice of these two unscrupulous youths, particularly in the case of friars.

[16] See note 38, preceding chapter.

[17] He had come to California with Echeandía under sentence of exile for two years. Bancroft, v, 699.

[18] Fr. Martínez's insolent jailer.

[19] Then only twenty-two years old, but already saturated with Voltairianism, and therefore imbued with the notion that it was good form to treat priests with arrogance.

[20] He also had come with Echeandía. The members were, with one exception, very much birds of the same feather.

the General Government;[21] that if he were compelled to proceed to Mexico nevertheless, the other missionaries would demand their passports, or take to flight, abandon the missions, and thus throw the whole territory into disorder, or they might start a new conspiracy. It had become apparent during the trial that Fr. Martínez had given aid to the Solís revolt,[22] and that he had as far back as June 26th, 1826, demanded his passport because he was not in sympathy with the new form of government. On the other hand Fathers Juan and Pedro Cabot had testified in favor of Fr. Martínez.[23]

After this unfavorable instruction to the jury a discussion followed. The result was that by a vote of five to one it was decided that Fr. Martínez should be banished, and should be placed on board the first ship available.[24] From the minutes it is impossible to determine which of the six officers braved the anger of Echeandía and voted for the venerable friar, as no names are given. However, as Domingo Carrillo is mentioned as attorney for the friar, we may presume that it was he who saved his name from infamy by refusing to share in the disgraceful verdict. Fr. Martínez himself had to swear "on the word and honor of a priest" that he would not leave the ship at any port of the Philippine or the Sandwich Islands, but that he would continue the voyage in the frigate as far as it sailed, and then take the first vessel for Europe.[25] Stephen Anderson, owner of the brig *Thomas*

---

[21] The proper thing would then have been to report to the government and await its decision. As it released the leader of the revolt, Solís, the result could not have been different in the case of the innocent friar; but the vindictive governor was bent on intimidating the missionaries and their friends.

[22] Which, as the reader sees, was not true.

[23] Fr. Sarriá had also testified in his favor. The minutes here do not mention this fact, probably because Echeandía omitted it.

[24] "Solís Proceso" in "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Ben. Military lxxii.

[25] "in verbo sacerdotis de no desembarcar en ningun puerto de Manila, ni de las Islas Sandwich, sino que irá hasta donde vaya la fragata, y de allí tomará el primer buque á Europa." "Solís Proceso."

Nowlan, had to give bonds to carry the prisoner to Calláo, Peru, and put him on board the first ship bound for Europe. The *Nowlan* sailed from Santa Barbara on March 20th, and on June 30th, 1830, Fr. Martínez wrote from Lima, Peru, to José de la Guerra, that he had arrived there. He made no allusion to the unkind treatment received in California. He finally reached Madrid, and thus Echeandía and his *paisano* abettors had succeeded in "ridding" the territory of a harmless friar who had deserved well of California, and who at most if let alone could have enjoyed but a few more years of life.[26]

"There were those," Bancroft ironically remarks, "who believed that Fr. Martínez carried away a large amount of money, an exploit, which if actually accomplished, considering the circumstances, surpassed in brilliancy all his previous deeds as contrabandista."[27] In a footnote more to show forth Vallejo's character, we believe, than for any other purpose, Bancroft quotes him as telling this wild story: "Vallejo says that he was the officer who took Martínez on board. He walked very slowly, but as he was old and corpulent he was not hurried. When they were alone in the cabin the padre said, 'Perhaps you thought me drunk. Not so, my son, but see here'—proceeding to show that his clothing was heavily lined with gold!"[28]

It was the governor who had engaged passage for the

---

[26] "De la Guerra Collection." Bancroft, iii, 99.

[27] Fr. Martínez was accused of smuggling, which Bancroft affects to believe, though the venerable missionary denied it, and no evidence has been adduced to prove it. The truth is that, like the covetous Vallejos, Picos, Bandinis, etc., on the subject of temporal gain, Bancroft judges the friars from his own standpoint of commercialism. It is an implied confession of his own weakness. The friars were not afflicted that way, as has been demonstrated time and again.

[28] Bancroft, iii, 100. Of a piece with these and other lying statements regarding the case is Vallejo's assertion, (see his "Historia," ii, 94, in Bancroft's Collection), that Ensign Rodrigo del Pliego was the fiscal; that he had proposed the death sentence against Fr. Martínez, but that he (Vallejo) had objected.

exiled missionary as far as Europe. The expenses of the voyage had therefore to be paid by the governor, and the captain of the vessel doubtless exacted payment in advance. As a friar Fr. Martínez could take nothing away from his mission, even if it had been possible to do so, save his personal effects. Even these, as we have seen, he had not had time to take along when apprehended. Such were the regulations of his College as well as of his Order; and to these all the friars adhered, all charges to the contrary notwithstanding. Mrs. Ord, the daughter of José de la Guerra, in whose house Lobato had closely guarded the Father, declared that Fr. Martínez took no money along.[29]

Echeandía announced the sentence of Fr. Martínez's exile to Fr. Prefect Sarriá on the same 9th of March.[30] The peace-loving and saintly old missionary seems to have received the information in silent resignation; there was nothing else for him to do, because for the time being might took the place of right in California. As for the Fathers, they were accustomed to suffer personal grievances in silence. It would please us more could we record that all had risen in protest, and shaken the dust from their feet, previously to leaving the now inhospitable and ungrateful land. Doubtless they would have taken some such steps if substitutes could have been found. As it was, they felt that they must not leave their neophyte wards exposed to the rapacity of those in control of the territory. So, for the time being, they stifled their just indignation, and prepared to battle for the rights of their poor Indian converts. When the war is declared on the missions their attitude will be different.[31]

Unfortunately the bad example of the white people from the governor down, and their treatment of the missionaries, were not lost on the Indians of the various missions. Echeandía and his covetous following had belittled the Fathers,

---

[29] Mrs. Ord, "Ocurrencias," in Bancroft's Collection.

[30] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. viii, 124-125.

[31] Only Fr. Durán, as presidente of the missions, later on gave vent to his indignation, and added some particulars in a letter to the President of Mexico, as we shall learn presently.

and had harangued the neophytes with lofty talk on liberty and equality with such effect,[32] that the seed thus planted could not fail to take root and produce a crop which was not at all to the liking of the would-be reformers. Disturbances occurred at several missions, notably in the south at San Luis Rey and San Juan Capistrano. The incessant military exactions increased the general discontent; for the missions now as before had to support the troops. In the spring of 1829 Estanislao, the Indian alcalde of Mission San José, induced a number of neophytes to withdraw with him and to fortify themselves near the pagan rancherias on the Rio San Joaquín. Fr. Durán notified Comandante Martínez of San Francisco who ordered Sergeant Antonio Soto with fifteen men to destroy the fortifications and to bring back the fugitives. In the skirmish which ensued Soto was mortally wounded, and several of the soldiers received more or less dangerous wounds. This caused the little band of men to retreat to San José where Soto soon after died.

Very much elated at this first victory over soldiers, the Indians celebrated their triumph with feasting and dancing. Other rancherias joined the rebels. It was feared that the uprising might become general. Ensign José Sánchez with forty men was therefore sent to take the fortifications. One attempt convinced him that his force was too weak to storm the works. The comandante of Monterey was then called upon for assistance. He accordingly ordered Ensign Mariano Vallejo with one hundred men and artillery to join Sánchez and to drive the rebels out of their stronghold. The Indians, armed only with bows and arrows, could not resist the fire

---

[32] "Lieutenant Romualdo Pacheco, having some trouble with Fr. Boscana at San Juan Capistrano," Bancroft relates (iii, 102), went so far as to assemble the neophytes and make a political speech, in which he told the Indians of a new chief (Echeandía) who had come to the country to be their friend, and give them equal rights with Spaniards." Mrs. Ord in Bancroft, iii, 104, says, "The ideas instilled into the minds of the neophytes by the gefe politico (Echeandía) made a great change in the Indians. They were not as contented nor as obedient as before." Ósio (ibidem), though not friendly to the friars, takes the same view.

of the muskets and cannon. Many were killed and others were captured. The troops also lost some of their number. Estanislao escaped and took refuge with Fr. Durán, who concealed the penitent neophyte and later procured his pardon.

After the battle the worst kind of barbarities were committed by the soldiers. Both Bancroft and Hittell relate that by order or consent of Mariano Vallejo several captives, including three women, were put to death. Fr. Durán made complaint about Vallejo's cruelties, but the ensign denied having sanctioned them. Echeandía ordered an investigation into the charge that three men and three women, not taken in battle, had been shot or hanged. The evidence showed that only one man and one woman had been shot by Joaquin Alvarado, one of Vallejo's soldiers. For this brutality Alvarado was sentenced to five years' penal servitude on the southern frontier. "There is no doubt," says Bancroft, "that in those, as



Signature of Fr. José María Guzmán.

in later times, to the Spaniards,[33] as to other so-called civilized races, the life of an Indian was a slight affair, and in nearly all the expeditions outrages were committed."[34]

Meanwhile Fr. Presidente José Bernardo Sánchez, weary of strife and responsibility, had repeatedly importuned the Col-

[33] In this case the culprits were Mexicans or Californians.

[34] Bancroft, iii, 109-114; Hittell, ii, 116-118. See chapter xii. Details will be found in the local history of each mission.

lege of San Fernando to relieve him of his office. At the chapter held May 26th, 1830, Fr. Guardian José Maria Guzmán of Zacatecas College presiding, his petition was granted and Fr. Narciso Durán was elected presidente of the missions. Lest at any time during the critical conditions existing in the territory the missionaries be without a head, Fr. Antonio Peiri and Fr. Antonio Jiméno were named to act as presidentes in succession in the event of incapacity, death, or departure of the incumbent.[35] The naming of substitutes was a wise measure; for Echeandía on December 7th, 1829, wrote to the Minister of Foreign Relations: "In virtue of the decision of the Hon. Vice-President,[36] which Your Excellency thought proper to communicate to me under date of July 1st, concerning the departure of the missionaries Fr. Vicente de Sarriá and Fr. Narciso Durán, even before the arrival of those from the Zacatecas College, who are to replace them, I am only waiting for an opportunity to order them to embark."[37] He never had the opportunity; for Echeandía himself had to leave the scene of his machinations. Before that date, however, he caused much damage to the missionary establishments, though he failed to remove any more missionaries.

---

[35] Fr. Guzmán to Fr. Durán, May 26th, 1830; Fr. Arreguín to Fr. Sánchez, July 2nd, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[36] Bustamante, who had become acting President of Mexico on January 1st, 1830. He must have experienced a total change of heart regarding the missionaries; for we shall find him corresponding in a most gracious manner with the same Fr. Durán whom Echeandía desired to banish.

[37] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. vii, 786.

SECTION II

FR. NARCISO DURÁN
(1830--1836)

PRESIDENTE

CHAPTER I.

A Summary.—Position of the Missionary Fathers in California.—They Pacify the Savages and Secure the Territory.—Wanted no Compensation but Freedom of Action.—They Support the Territorial Government and Troops.—Indebtedness of the Californians to the Missions.—Ingratitude of the Paisanos.—Their Religious Indifference.—Fr. Viader's Complaint.—Motive of the Paisano Hostility.—Echeandía Proposes the Confiscation of the Mission Property.—Meaning of the Decree of 1813.—Real Motive Again.—Echeandía's Plan Adopted by the California Assembly; Rejected in Mexico.—A Ridiculous Project.—Schools.—Why They Failed.

THE attentive reader will have observed that the history of the missions thus far is the account of incessant struggles on the part of the missionaries against all kinds of opposing forces. This is the more astonishing as the friars had been called to aid the civil and military authorities in securing the territory for the crown of Spain by winning the natives for Christianity and leading them to become loyal subjects. The soldiery without missionaries in previous attempts, and in spite of an expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars, had failed to accomplish the task. One should suppose that the missionaries would have received every encouragement from those in power; but, as the preceding pages demonstrate, such assistance seldom, if ever, came to cheer the dreary existence of the Fathers among their dull converts. A mission fund, donated by private benefactors nearly a century before, existed. This would have provided sufficiently for the establishment and maintenance of the missions, if the converts devoted themselves to such industries as their needs demanded, and if this outside revenue had been always continued, or if no additional burdens had been placed upon the missionary establishments by the troops.

To insure the success of the two chief aims—the conversion and civilization of the savages—so much land belonging to the aborigines in the neighborhood of their principal settlements

as could be cultivated advantageously was set apart in order to give occupation to the neophytes, and to raise the produce and live-stock required for the support of a large mission population. Whatever was accumulated by the combined efforts of the missionaries and converts was regarded as the common property of the neophytes, and it was intended to be turned over to them as soon as they had learned to govern themselves, and had proved capable of managing such property. The missionaries never claimed any part of the wealth created and collected under their direction. They considered themselves stewards or guardians of the Indians in their charge until the latter should have reached majority and proved their ability to stand alone. This might be after ten, twenty or more years. In that case the friars would withdraw in order to give place to priests sent by the bishop of the diocese, who would, as in the parishes of white people, attend only to the spiritual needs of their parishioners, whilst the neophytes thus emancipated or liberated from parental tutelage managed their lands and other property in common or in severalty by themselves, without interference from any white officials. This meant secularizing the missions, that is to say, substituting secular for regular priests, and placing the Indians on a level with white citizens to control their own property. Unfortunately, in California the Indians seemed to require centuries instead of decades, just as was the case with the tribes that inhabited Europe, before they acquired habits of industry and could be judged competent of administering their temporal affairs without assistance.

In return for pacifying the savages and for transforming them into peaceful subjects the Spanish Government agreed to protect the lives of the missionaries and of their converts, as well as the property of the establishments they erected, by stationing three or five guards, generally fewer, at each mission. As a matter of good policy the secular authorities should have subsidized and in every way encouraged the missionary enterprise, since the Fathers were peacefully, effectively, and inexpensively securing the object of the conquest. The missionaries, however, desired nothing more than liberty

to teach Religion and civilization to their Indians without interference. During the forty years while the Spanish Government, for the most part grudgingly, complied with its agreement, the missionary Fathers contrived to establish nineteen Christianizing and civilizing centers known as missions. In the meantime, despite unfavorable conditions and much opposition, they achieved a success which surpassed that of any similar effort anywhere in the limits of the United States: they gathered, instructed, and baptized 51,400 Indians who but for the labors of the missionaries would most probably never have known the Creator, nor the end for which they existed on earth. At the same time they weaned their converts from a life of abject idleness, taught them how to support themselves, and put them on the road to become useful citizens. This goal they would eventually attain if not hurried and if granted sufficient opportunities. All this cost the government nothing, since the friars, in keeping with the rules of their Order, served without compensation. The allowance from the Pious Fund, while it lasted, was used for embellishing the churches or turned into the general mission fund. In like manner were alms or donations used which were given to the missionaries personally.

Things might have continued this way indefinitely, or until the Indians had attained the degree of self-reliance and civilization desired. Unfortunately the cry for independence in Mexico after the year 1811 cut off the supplies of the soldiery as well as the scant allowance of the missionaries. Both were then thrown on their own resources. Nevertheless, instead of becoming a burden to the governments of either Mexico or California, or lessening their own activity, the missions for the next twenty years proved the salvation of the territory in that they furnished subsistence for the military from the governor down to the last soldier in the ranks, who but for the managing friars and their neophytes must have starved or abandoned the country. The consequence was that, not counting the donations, taxes, and money contributions received from the missions at great hardship to the Indians and their missionary guides, the governors and their troops after twenty

years were in arrears to the missionary establishments to the amount of nearly $500,000 for supplies, and this has never been paid!

Instead of acknowledging this great assistance from the missions; instead of giving due credit to the missionaries for their unselfish endeavors to relieve the want which largely resulted from the improvidence of the troops; these benefits so generously bestowed on soldiers and settlers only whetted the greed of those who were succored, and of others who expected to advance their own interests by obtaining control of the mission property which had been rendered valuable through the exertions of the unsalaried religious. In order to gain their point, these ingrates and the covetous, with no heart for the Indians, had recourse to calumny. They would charge the friars with cruelty, though no case could be proved and the missionaries administered no greater penalties for misdeeds than fathers apply to their children, or the mildest police authorities inflict on transgressors of the law. Next they would accuse the Franciscans of accumulating wealth at the expense of the neophytes, and of sending such wealth out of the country, or of intending to forward it to Spain or anywhere, though not one instance could be cited in proof of such transaction, and though the slanderers well knew that the friars by their vows were bound not to retain a dollar for themselves or for any one else from the mission funds or from any fund belonging to the convert Indians. Thereupon the relentless critics claimed the missions occupied too much land, when every one had to concede that this land of right belonged to the Indians and was secured to them by just laws. Furthermore it was charged that the missions were excessively wealthy and that the friars were living sumptuously like independent landlords, whereas the official reports demonstrated that the missionary establishments barely managed to feed and clothe the neophytes and could not, by reason of the incessant demands of the military, do more than hold their own. Even if the missions had been as rich as represented, it was property accumulated by hard work, and the owners were entitled to enjoy it. Had the soldiers

and settlers been as industrious as the Indians and their spiritual guides they, too, might have possessed sufficient wealth to maintain themselves and their families without envying the mission population what belonged to them. The missionaries had grown old and feeble under the double burden of having to provide food and clothing for both the Indians and soldiers, and at the same time having to attend to the spiritual wants of Indians as well as white people. Yet their unscrupulous adversaries grudged them the bare subsistence to which their position as missionaries entitled them; this, too, for no other reason than that their cradles had happened to stand in Spain, or rather because the mission enemies coveted the Indian property for themselves. Another libel was that the Fathers opposed the colonization of California, whereas, on the contrary, Fr. Serra as early as 1773, and others later on, proposed plans for white settlements on the lines marked out by Spanish laws which respected the rights of the natives. The missionaries certainly opposed the introduction of idlers and immoral adventurers who speculated on the simplicity and helplessness of the Indians, and aimed at obtaining control of the mission property. Finally, the adversaries charged the Fathers with making no efforts to advance the neophytes, in order that they might keep control of the temporalities. The Indians needed as much time, at least, as the European ancestors to reach the degree of civilization that was desirable. Most of them had but a short time emerged from paganism and idleness. It was absurd to demand that they should in a decade or two in everything be on an equality with industrious white people. Even now the United States Government recognizes this fact and therefore sees it necessary to keep them in reservations, and the property in charge of government agents, lest the Indians be swindled out of their lands and debauched by heartless fortune hunters. For the same reasons the missionaries held to their post until either death or the government should relieve them of the responsibility of protecting the neophytes against white rapacity. The mission enemies succeeded in time. What means they employed to gain their object of ousting the defenders of the Indians

will appear in the course of the narrative, and has already come to light to some extent. Meanwhile the Fathers were happy enough, despite all obstacles, to add 37,000 Indians to the list of their converts, so that by the year 1830 the baptismal registers showed the names of 80,000 baptized natives, most of whom had passed out of the reach of rapacious adventurers by dying the death of Christians.

We now enter upon the saddest period of the mission history: the destruction of the missionary establishments by the covetous Californians under the guidance, as we have seen, of Echeandía and his evil genius Padrés. It will help the reader very much to comprehend what follows if he will take into consideration the spiritual condition of the *paisanos* and others at the close of 1830. Most of the missionaries had become feeble with old age or infirmities, yet they toiled on, alone in nearly all cases, while their hearts were heavy with grief at sight of the impiety creeping into their flocks. As usual they made their annual reports to the Fr. Presidente. Only a few drop an expression here and there from which the discouraging circumstances of the respective missions as well as the religious state of the white population may be inferred. Fr. Viader's description of the situation at Santa Clara may be regarded as typical.

"Several times," he tells Fr. Presidente Sánchez, "I have wanted to write to you about those who last Lent failed to comply with the annual obligation of receiving the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Eucharist; but, inasmuch as I on the other hand thought that there is no other remedy than to recommend the matter to God, I have hesitated to trouble you and to trouble myself. I have told them from the foot of the altar[1] that if any one died without confession he could not be buried in the cemetery; also that if any one fell sick and called for me, I would not hear his confession unless he first publicly asked pardon for his bad example in not

[1] Probably at the town of San José, which was attended from Santa Clara. The town people also frequented the mission chapel, and may have been told there. See Engelhardt, "The Holy Man of Santa Clara," 99; 150; 167-168.

having complied with his Easter Duty; for if the scandal is public, as in effect it is, public must be the satisfaction. Every year, after growing tired waiting, I sent a list to the alcalde, but as he is afraid to punish them, he is content with threatening, warning, and advising them. This is in vain, for they laugh at everything.[2] The new alcalde is himself one of them,[3] and I fear some trouble. I hope Your Reverence will tell me what is to be done in this particular. I further re-



Signature of Fr. José Viadér.

mark that, if nothing is done soon, this will be a commonwealth of Protestants."[4]

From this it is clear that Catholic Faith, at least among the male portion, had waxed exceedingly cold with the settlers around Santa Clara, since they ceased to receive the Sacraments. If such was the case where a saint,[5] had labored and preached for thirty-six years, and where he had died but two months before, we may imagine the situation elsewhere, notably at Monterey, the hotbed of political intrigue and loose life. We need not then be surprised at the reckless cupidity and want of ordinary justice displayed by the *paisanos* or native sons, as the Californians loved to style themselves, let alone the cold brutality of the Mexican instigators Padrés and Echeandía. When the Catholic ceases the reception of the Sacraments, the test of membership in the Church, he discontinues being a practical Catholic, and his motives generally are ambition, greed, or concupiscence of the flesh. Abject ignorance in religious matters inflated by reading irreligious

---

[2] "Ellos de todo se rien."

[3] Mariano Duarte. See Bancroft, iii, 195.

[4] This term with him included all non-Catholics. Fr. Viadér to Fr. Sánchez, January 18th, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[5] Fr. Magín Catalá, the process for whose beatification has been taken up in Rome but lately. See "The Holy Man of Santa Clara," San Francisco, 1909.

works, such as those of Voltaire and other French infidels, must be added in the case of the Californians and Mexicans of that period. Hence it was that they not only declared themselves independent of Spain, which of itself was no crime, but they also emancipated themselves from the Ten Commandments of God and the Precepts of their Church. Hence the outrages against the benevolent institutions in Mexico, against the Indian missions and their directors, the Franciscan friars, in California. We have instances of this same conduct and its causes on the part of the same class of men, and for the same motives, in France and Portugal at this writing. It was not that any just and serious fault could be found with the missionaries or their missions; but brutal passions had seized the hearts and blinded the reasoning powers. From such as these, naturally, the defenceless and helpless Indians, much less their religious guides, could expect no pity. Having thus cleared the vision we may proceed with the prospect of better understanding the succeeding events.

During all these years, as we have already said, the missions continued to feed and clothe not only the neophytes but also the troops of the whole territory. Frequently the Fathers and their wards deprived themselves of the very necessaries in order to satisfy the endless requests of their oppressors. Nevertheless, Echeandía and the *paisanos* could not rest easy. Had these men been sincere Christians they would have rejoiced at the work which the missionaries were accomplishing with the rude natives, and they would have deprived themselves of necessaries in order that the converts might not suffer want. Such is the practice among true Catholics the world over. At the very least they would have let these ecclesiastical institutions severely alone, and would have attended to their own affairs as scrupulously as the missionaries were attending to those that concerned themselves and their wards. It was bad enough that the civil and military officials and the Californians generally refused to lend their moral assistance for transforming the savages into faithful Christians and industrious citizens. It was worse that the

Indians noticed in the white people nothing that gave them a lofty idea of either Christianity or white citizenship; that on the contrary they had to observe that the *paisanos* treated Religion and its ministers with indifference if not with contempt; and that all they as Indians could expect in the future was the sorry privilege of performing the menial work of the people who haughtily styled themselves the *gente de razon*[6] as if they possessed the monopoly of that mental faculty, in contradistinction to the poor neophytes whom they treated with unfeeling scorn.

The hostility to the missionaries on the part of Echeandía and his youthful adherents was not provoked because the friars misappropriated the funds belonging to the Indians, or mismanaged the temporalities, for nothing of the kind could be laid at the door of the Fathers. Indeed, had the Fathers not been so economical, the constant drain on the products of the missions by the military would have ruined the establishments ere Echeandía appeared in California. Nor could it be asserted that the salary of the friars consumed the proceeds, for they received no salary and would accept none. On the contrary, whatever could be squeezed out of the missions by the governor and his aids was used to maintain in idleness the mission oppressors, and those who clamored loudest that the unsalaried Franciscans should be replaced by salaried officials from among the *gente de razon*. Much less could it be charged that the missionaries were not teaching the neophytes to lead Christian and moral lives. It was quite the other way. The immorality or the disregard for the divine law of the very men who claimed to possess intelligence and denied it to the Indians was one of the worst obstacles with which the missionaries had to contend. It mattered not that these missions for the past twenty years had preserved the life of the very *paisanos* who now plotted to drive out the country's benefactors. They were equally devoid of either gratitude or manhood. Religion could not deter them, because what religion they possessed was akin to the deism of Voltaire from whom and his kind they preferred to learn what priests and religious

[6] People of Intelligence.

are, rather than to take the lesson from the unselfish men before their very eyes. Greed had taken possession of the mission enemies, and no consideration of gratitude or justice would stop them in their warfare on the missionaries as the only obstruction barring their iniquitous course.

Hence it was that on July 20th, 1830, Echeandía laid before the territorial assembly his plan for the confiscation of the missions without waiting for the action of the Supreme Government. He did not, of course, broach the subject under that term, but like all scheming politicians he dealt in catchwords for the purpose of clothing wicked measures in a respectable garb in order to deceive the unwary. The governor called his plan "secularization." We shall apply the right term throughout: *confiscation*. It was nothing less. Bancroft, always ready to excuse anything anti-Catholic, endeavors to defend the act on the ground that Echeandía was proposing nothing more than what the Spanish Córtes had decreed in 1813. As both Mexico and California had thrown off Spanish rule, and both were governed according to Mexican laws, the force of the argument is not apparent, even if the Spanish rump congress [7] had decreed anything like the project which the mission despoilers proposed. Dwinelle [8] holds that the decree never attained the force of law as far as the California missions were concerned. At all events, neither the Spanish Government at home, nor the viceroyal government in Mexico, hurried to execute the decree. They both took the sane view that the California neophytes had not advanced far enough to come under the provisions of said decree, which after all had been passed by a usurping power. Nor was the Mexican Republican Government eager to make a change in the status of the missions. The whole scheme was engineered by Echeandía,

[7] See chapter vi, section i, this volume. This self-constituted córtes was not recognized by the king, and not till seven years later were some of its decrees forced on the country by another córtes of a similar composition.

[8] "Colonial History," Narrative, p. 39, parag. 53.

INTERIOR OF THE CHURCH OF SAN FERNANDO, CITY OF MEXICO.

who at that very moment knew that his successor had already been appointed.

However, even though the decree of the rump congress had attained the force of law, and even if it were binding upon California, and its immediate execution imperative, all of which is not true, yet the mission robbers could find no justification for the measure which Echeandía proposed and which was eventually carried out by another. As the text of the decree shows [9] the córtes contemplated secularization, but not confiscation. To secularize an Indian mission, as decreed and practiced under Spanish rule, meant that the missionary belonging to a religious Order should make room for a secular priest under the direct authority of the diocesan bishop, and that all the property, save the church building, the priest's habitation, the garden, and the vineyard, should be turned over to the neophytes to be managed in common by officials chosen from among the same neophytes. Such a change was only made when the neophytes were deemed advanced enough to administer their property without loss to themselves, and when the bishop consented to place a secular priest in charge of the spiritual affairs of the community, or ex-mission.

The Franciscans had repeatedly offered to surrender their places to secular priests, just as Fr. Serra and his companions had ceded the Sierra Gorda missions to the Archbishop of Mexico in order to found missions in California; [10] but the Bishop of Sonora had always declared that there were no priests available to take the places of the friars. Moreover, he was perfectly satisfied with the work of the Franciscans. The viceroys also had seen no reason why the friars should not be left in charge of the temporal management as long as the Indians were cared for and conducted themselves peacefully under the rule of the missionaries. Hence, if, as soon as the Spanish Government had been overthrown, Echeandía and the *paisanos* in California demanded the re-

[9] See chapter vi, section i, this volume.

[10] See vol. i, 394-396.

moval of the missionaries, their real motive was not that the decree of the córtes, or the desire of the bishop, or the wishes of the neophytes should be carried out; in none of these cases could the Californians hope to gain any advantage for themselves. Their aim was not the benefit of the convert Indians, for these lived contented until Echeandía roused some of them by his specious talk on liberty and equality; nor decrease of cost to the government or to the missions, for the friars served without pay and the missions cost the government nothing, rather they supported the territorial government; much less the welfare of Religion in which Echeandía and the Californians took no interest, but which they were damaging beyond repair. Least of all could greater progress of the mission temporalities be the motive of demanding a change; for, whereas the friars had reared and made them prosperous and thus proved their ability to maintain them, the adversaries were sucking the life out of them and causing decay. Hence, nothing but greed and disregard for Religion prompted the clique led by the governor to demand the confiscation of the missions under the deceptive term of secularization.

Echeandía's plan was discussed in the sessions of the assembly, composed of only four members besides the governor and the secretary, from July 20th to August 3rd, 1830, and then adopted on the last-named date. The twenty-one articles of this document provided for the gradual transformation of the missions into pueblos, beginning, significantly enough, with those nearest the presidios and white settlements. The temporalities of one or two were to be taken from the missionaries, that is to say, confiscated, and put in charge of salaried comisionados, within a year, and the rest should be similarly transformed as rapidly as experience might show it to be practicable. What the Indians might have to say on the subject was not considered. Each neophyte was to have a share of the mission lands and other property. The friars might remain as curates, or establish a new line of missions among the savages if they wished. The document was signed by José M. Echeandía, Antonio

Buelna, José Tibúrcio Castro, Sálvio Pacheco, Carlos Castro, and J. B. Alvarado, who acted as secretary to the "respetable diputacion."[11] Having received the endorsement of the five men who constituted the legislative assembly, Echeandía thought the general government would not hesitate to issue orders for the enforcement of the plan. He therefore sent it for approval to Mexico on September 7th, 1830.[12] By the time the document reached the capital another administration had come into power, and this by no means sanctioned the governor's proceedings. Moreover, another governor had already been appointed and was on his way to California, a fact of which Echeandía was well aware, and this circumstance renders his action the more odious.

Meanwhile the governor and his abettors in the scheme of spoliation desired to appear solicitous for the spiritual welfare of the territory, and therefore concocted another plan which showed how little they knew of Religion and much less of the subject about which they presumed to legislate. On August 13th the same legislative assembly passed the following decree, which it is worth the while to perpetuate as a curiosity. "1. Two Franciscan monasteries shall be established in Upper California, one at Mission San Gabriel and the other at Mission Santa Clara. For this purpose the government will without delay take steps to have twenty or more religious of the Order go there. It shall provide from the Pious Fund for the expenses of the voyage and for transportation, and shall assign the main building, the church, and the garden of said missions for that purpose. 2. Each monastery shall have at least a guardian, a master of novices,

[11] Buelna and José Castro composed the committee on Treasury and Missions. Carlos Castro was in charge of Education. "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 291; 340-345.

[12] Bancroft, iii, 107. "Echeandía undertook to carry into effect the neglected act of the córtes of 1813 for the secularization of the missions. The devastation of the missions now commenced. The Indians were encouraged in their refusal to labor; their emancipation they thought meant freedom from work, and the license to indulge in every form of vice; but the evil day was postponed by the arrival of a successor to Echeandía." Tuthill, "California," 131.

and an assistant for the latter, who shall also occupy the chair of grammar, and a vicar. 3. When the clerics are ready for ordination, they shall for that purpose pass over the water or land to the nearest diocese. The expenses of the journey shall be paid from the revenues of the existing missions, and from other alms on which the monastery will subsist according to the regulations of their Order. 4. The missions that shall be vacated, those that may be turned into pueblos, and those that may be newly founded, shall be respectively attended by the religious trained in said monasteries. In addition, this class of missionaries may also serve as pastors or chaplains in the pueblos and presidios; and they shall receive a fixed compensation if the community have any funds to pay it, or from the taxes to be imposed according to the needs of each individual. 5. The government shall regulate the method which must be observed in new missions with regard to catechetical instruction, the management and domestic corrections, and to what point they must recognize the secular authority in the said interior administration of said missions, and under what circumstances and conditions these must be transformed into pueblos. 6. The Spanish missionaries in charge at present, and who favor the independence and our system of government, shall be enabled to occupy any office in said monasteries; and these as well as the rest that shall profess fidelity to the government shall continue to administer the missions in their care, or any other office in the territory, and shall therefore be exempt from the Law of March 20th, 1829." [18]

This bit of ridiculous legislation, which speaks volumes for the ignorance, audacity, impertinence and conceit of its perpetrators, was signed by the same individuals that appended

---

[18] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 321-322. The young California liberals were quick to learn from their Mexican and European prototypes what estimate to put on Religion and religious Orders. It is strange that men who would resent interference with their own private affairs display such fondness for improving the works of God and His Church, instead of simply bringing their own conduct in line with His Commandments.

their names to Echeandía's plan of confiscation, except Carlos Castro. Both documents reached Mexico where Echeandía's plan was finally approved by the minister of relations and recommended to Congress at the beginning of 1831. The majority in that body, however, opposed any change in the status of the missions. The plan for the founding of two convents was referred to the minister of justice, who doubtless allowed it to be forgotten, for nothing more was heard of it thereafter.[14]

The same deputation, doubtless prompted by Echeandía, as the Californians in general cared little more for book-learning than the Indians, passed a measure of more merit, but which met with the same fate that befell other laws of similar import before. On July 16th, 1830, it ordained that in every mission primary schools should be opened, and teachers employed at thirty dollars per month wherever possible. At other places they should make provisions in accordance with their means.[15] The governor as early as 1827 had urged the Fr. Prefect to have schools established, and Fr. Sarriá had promised to give instructions to that effect in a circular, but he expresed doubt that his wishes could be carried out everywhere.[16] The circular was issued, but reports from only two places are extant. Fr. Sancho of San Antonio wrote that after two years he had been unable to establish a school for want of a teacher.[17] This was probably the drawback all over the territory. Fr. Sánchez, on the other hand, reported "that at San Gabriel there were some boys who have begun to learn and even to print the letters, but, as laborers are scarce, it is necessary to call upon the boys to assist. The consequence is that in six days they for-

[14] Bancroft, iii, 107-109.

[15] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 381-382.

[16] Echeandía to Fr. Sarriá, July 3rd, 1827; Fr. Sarriá to Echeandía, July 9th; "Circular," July 9th, 1827. "Archb. Arch.," no. 1941.

[17] Fr. Sancho to Echeandía, April 22nd, 1829. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2056.

get what they have learned in four." [18] What the result was elsewhere is not known, but the chief trouble was the dearth of teachers. Then the neophytes had already grown restless and intractable, owing to the example of the white people



Signature of Fr. Juan B. Sancho.

from the governor down, who belittled the missionaries, and harangued the Indians with loose talk on liberty and equality, so that the seed thus planted could not fail to take root and produce the fruit which was not at all to the liking of the Californians. Had the governor and the *paisanos* allowed the missionaries to manage the Indians as in the beginning, and had the military aided the Fathers by their example, if in no other way, and had the missionaries not been compelled to devote so much time to satisfy the demands of the governor and his subordinates, there is no doubt that the Indians would have received the book learning suitable to the surroundings in which they had to live. As it was the effect of outside interference daily became manifest in the turbulence of the natives.

The arrogance of Echeandía was imitated by his subordinates and this caused more disorder. An instance is reported from Mission San José. Writing to the governor under date of November 29th, 1830, Fr. Durán complains: "Some neophytes whom I had sent to the guardhouse in punishment for domestic transgressions were taken to the presidio. I have discovered that this was done in virtue of the following

[18] "Hay algunos muchachos que principian á conocer las letras, como tambien á pintarlas; mas como la gente se escasea, teniendo que hechar mano de ellos se ve, que lo que en cuatro dias aprenden, en seis se les olvidan." Fr. Sánchez to Echeandía, August 26th, 1828. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2033.

order of Comandante Ignácio Martínez to the corporals of the guards: 'I charge you that every Indian locked in the guardhouse should be immediately sent to this presidio (San Francisco), although they are held for only slight faults. This I hope will be done as I command.'

"From this order it follows that every Indian who is locked up, *even though it be for correction on account of slight faults only,* is sentenced to the presidio. Your Honor must see in this what I see in it, and that is the most offensive despotism and the trampling under foot of the paternal and domestic authority of the missionaries. I supplicate Your Honor to be pleased to remedy this as speedily as possible, as I cannot consent that an order continue in force which is so oppressive to the unfortunate Indians, (who by their labor feed their oppressors), without trying every means within my reach. The first step is having recourse to the fairness and authority of Your Honor with the confidence that you will not be deaf to the cries of the oppressed." [19] The next step would have been an appeal to the Federal Government. Happily Echeandía was soon after relieved of his position, and the new governor doubtless removed the cause of contention, though we have no record of the action taken.

Before the close of the year 1830 a new diputacion or legislative assembly was chosen. The electors of California on October 3rd met at Monterey and first named a delegate to represent the territory in the Mexican Congress during the years 1831 and 1832. Carlos Antonio Carrillo received the majority of the votes. Juan Bandini was designated as substitute. Next day the electors chose Mariano G. Vallejo, Joaquín Ortega, and Antonio M. Ósio to take the places of three retiring members of the territorial assembly. The new substitutes were Francisco de Haro, Tomás Yorba, and Santiago Argüello.[20]

---

[19] "Archb. Arch.," no. 2090. The italics are Fr. Durán's.

[20] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. viii, 506-507; Bancroft, iii, 50; Hittell, ii, 122-123.

CHAPTER II.

President Bustamante to Fr. Durán.—Reply.—The Missionaries Ill-treated.—Indians Oppressed by the Troops.—Insecurity of the Territory.—Missionaries Threatened.—Fr. Martínez Shamelessly Arrested at San Luis Obispo.—Outrageously Treated at Santa Barbara.—Farcical Court-Martial.—Echeandía's Despotism.—Missionaries Falsely Accused.—Appeal for Protection to the President.—Another Letter from Bustamante.—Lengthy Reply.—Stipends not Wanted Unless the Troops Are First Paid.—Neophytes Still Backward.—A Way out of the Difficulty.—Commerce.—Propositions.—Good Will of the Bustamante Administration.

FROM the examination to which the prisoner Solís and the banished Herrera [1] were subjected in Mexico the Supreme Government most probably received the impression that Echeandía must be the real cause of the wide-spread dissatisfaction in California; for not only was Solís set free and Herrera returned to his post, but President Anastasio Bustamante [2] addressed a letter to Fr. Narciso Durán calling for information on the conditions in the territory. The fact is noteworthy for the reason that Fr. Durán, like Fr. Sarriá, was marked for expulsion by the despotic governor. The reply, though lengthy, is here reproduced almost entire, because it throws much light on certain occurrences which otherwise would remain very obscure. Fr. Presidente Durán writes as follows:

"Most Excellent President: By the brig *Maria Ester* I have received a letter which is well worthy of the noble and good heart of Your Excellency. In it you begin by inform-

---

[1] See chapter xvii, section 1, this volume.

[2] President Guerréro had been deposed and was later executed. Bustamante on January 1st, 1830, assumed the reins of government, and soon after despatched his letter to Fr. Durán. "In his private life he was exemplary," says Bancroft (Mexico v, 94). That speaks well for him and explains his conservatism in public life.

ing me that the universal will of the Mexican Nation has been pleased to entrust to your strength a heavy burden in calling you to the head of the Federal Government. Your Excellency expects that the peaceful and industrious citizens will correspond with your hopes, and will assist you and those who share with you the burden to carry out your aims for the common welfare of the whole republic. Your Excellency also regards it as fortunate that the economic and Christian interests of this mission [3] have been confided to me, and you doubt not that I shall persevere in such an honorable and sacred position.[4] After such flattering remarks Your Excellency tells me that through the respective cabinet minister the necessary instructions will be sent to me concerning the public progress of this portion of our people, which with so much justice attracts the attention of the Supreme Government. Finally Your Excellency crowns the height of your kindness by placing Your Honorable Person at my disposal.

"Not at all conversant, Your Excellency, with the polished expressions of mere words nor with rhetorical exaggerations, I will only say with the inborn candor of a simple and religious heart, that I am deeply sensible of the condescension of Your Excellency; and whilst I find no other words to express my feelings than to protest, as I do protest, that I am filled with the best will to co-operate with the sublime intentions of Your Excellency, I would right now say to you that you could rely on whatever my weak efforts might be able to accomplish for the good of the territory, if the hostility of the times and the conditions by which we missionaries find ourselves surrounded did not cause us misgivings as to

---

[3] Mission San José. Much in Fr. Durán's letter has already been stated, but it will bear repetition and make the situation clearer.

[4] Fr. Durán at this time knew nothing of his reappointment to the presidency of the California missions, though it seems Bustamante had been notified. Fr. Sánchez, the incumbent, dreaded political subjects, whereas Fr. Durán was more than a match for the Californians and their prompters. Hence it was that Bustamante turned to Fr. Durán.

our ability to persevere in bearing the burden of so heavy a cross.

"Your Excellency will at once conclude that I feel a loathing to persevere in my position. Far from wishing to deceive you, I frankly confess that only for the sake of my conscience, and on account of the extreme spiritual need of the people, due to the lack of priests, I do not now insist that my passport be given to me. I am fully entitled to it as the foreigner I now am,[5] though I do not desire it in order to return to my native land—something I have never wished nor wish—but to leave a land in which, by reason of the original sin brought on with birth, hatred for this religious body of missionaries is not only openly professed, but their virtues and disinterestedness, so well known among the foreign merchants,[6] receive not the slightest respect, consideration, or acknowledgment from the territorial government. On account of the remoteness of this territory, and above all on account of our helpless and defenceless position, we are with impunity harassed, threatened, watched, and even insulted for no other reason than that we refuse to meddle with politics, as such meddling would only tend to the great dishonor of our sacred character and religious calling, to the most grievous affliction of our souls, and to the hardships of our bodies already worn out by long and wearisome service, by age, and by infirmities.

"Your Excellency will readily be persuaded of the vexations which we suffer, if you will keep in mind that it is only the missions which support the military garrisons of the territory. The number of the soldiers is so excessive that nothing is saved from our resources. It is worse in the present year which has been one not only of dearth but of universal hunger for lack of rain, and on account of the

---

[5] That is what the California ingrates called the self-sacrificing missionaries without whose presence and efforts starvation would have driven the lazy nativists from the territory.

[6] English and American traders and colonists, who generally were imbued with a spirit of fairness and therefore friendly to the friars.

locust plague that did away with what was planted. Yet, under these sad circumstances our missions are filled with soldiers; demands are made upon us in a bellicose manner, and we are threatened as though we were guilty of treason against the nation, and, whereas other classes of the population are allowed to enjoy the fruit of their labor, we are forced to take the morsel from the hungry mouths of our unhappy neophytes.[7] How shocking to take away the necessary food for their subsistence, making us veritable instruments of their oppression in place of spiritual and domestic parents, merely to gratify the endless needs of the presidios!

"If in the midst of such great sacrifices there only were general content; if only there existed personal security, protection for the weak and helpless; if there were but a satisfactory application of the public income of the treasury and a right administration of justice, which would shield us from so many a rascal who suddenly appears and throws the whole territory into consternation; (this would require nothing more than a simple order and corresponding chastisement;) if all this existed, I say, one could live; but, Your Excellency, it is certain that the general spirit of the territory is opposed to it. Hence we observe nothing more than indolence, immorality, public scandals, depredations, and insecurity of person and property. As a proof of this the revolt of last November[8] is in evidence. To be sure, it was not directed against the Federal Government, but solely against the person of the comandante-general[9] and his government. Though it was happily put down, it has cost immense sacrifices, hardship, and dissatisfaction, especially to the missions and missionaries.

"Nevertheless, who should believe it! though the mission-

---

[7] "Se nos hacen pedidos militarmente y amenazandonos con responsibilidades como reos de lesa nacion, y cuando á las demas clases se les deja gozar el tanto de sus trabajos, á nosotros se nos fuerza á quitar de las bocas hambrientas de nuestros infelices neófitos el alimento."

[8] The rebellion of the convict Solís.

[9] Governor Echeandía.

aries took no part or knew nothing of the plotting against the person of the comandante-general and his government, after infinite labor and sacrifices for the defense of the command of the said governor himself, and after having borne in every sense the most disagreeable share, because we were called upon and molested by both contending parties, we as the result have earned the imminent danger of being treated with the greatest caprice and contempt on the part of said comandante at the least unguarded word (though it may be true), reported by some ingrate from among the many who daily enjoy our hospitality. There is talk already of resorting to force in this inquisitorial manner against one missionary.[10] At any rate, what is not doubtful are the insults, the outrages, injustice, violence, sacrilege, and scandals committed at Mission San Luis Obispo, and later at the presidio of Santa Barbara against the venerable person of the Rev. Fr. Luis Martínez then at the age of sixty-four years.[11] Thirty-four of these years he spent in the service of the missions. With military bustle and in the most degrading manner, directed or carried out by a lieutenant named Lobato, Fr. Martínez was seized and led away as a prisoner, thus trampling on canon and civil laws which prescribe the formalities to be observed with regard to church asylum, and thus violating in a sacrilegious manner the immunity of the parochial residence of the missionary religious adjoining the church, and the personal immunity of a missionary priest and the pastor of the town, despite the public scandal, especially to these tender plants of Religion. There was absolutely no necessity for such arrest, since the said Father and we all are as lambs without a mouth[12] to complain and may be led to the slaughterhouse with impunity by merely giving the simple

[10] Probably Fr. Sarriá or Fr. Durán himself.

[11] Others have it that Fr. Martínez was born in 1771. Fr. Martínez himself gave his age as sixty-four years.

[12] It is a fact that even after his banishment in his letters Fr. Martínez never complained of his revengeful and unjust persecutors.

order.[13] Instead, Fr. Martínez was led away with much show of absolute authority, as if he were an evil-doer and a traitor to the nation, and his mission was left without a priest.

"When the aged Father arrived at aforesaid presidio the climax was placed on the bold indecency and most sacrilegious indignity; for they tried to have him taken away in irons to San Blas on board a foreign ship. Fortunately the captain, notwithstanding that he was a Protestant, refused. They then kept him for many days in a despotic manner without telling him the reason for his imprisonment, or telling why he was deprived of the liberties granted by the constitution. They hindered him to perform any functions of his ministry even when he was called to hear the confession of a sick person while there was no other priest at hand. Then out of mere spite and tyranny they wanted to send him away overland to make the journey by way of the Colorado River, notwithstanding that he was incapacitated by reason of his gout, and thus expose him to the cruelty of the Apaches who are now more fierce than ever. Thereupon they held a court-martial for the purpose of inflicting sacrilegious violence and with contempt for the ecclesiastical and other laws which visit the violators of immunity. Before this arbitrary court they refused the Father the counsel of his choice under the pretext that he was not a Mexican citizen, although he was a Columbian citizen. The true reason, however, was that they feared the accused religious would be sure to prove his innocence. Next they named as prosecutor the very same man who illtreated the Father so badly at his mission.[14] At last, giving way to the manifest public opinion against violence,[15] the majority of the court-martial decided that the

---

[13] A simple notification would have brought the Father to Santa Barbara; but Echeandía, heedless of the scandal to the neophytes, was bent on making a show of his power over the defenceless missionaries.

[14] Lieutenant Lobato. Vallejo says Pliego was the fiscal. See section i, chapter xviii, note 28.

[15] i. e. putting Fr. Martínez in irons.

Father should embark on the frigate *Thomas Nowlan,* just what he had always wished; for notwithstanding that the governor had granted to Fr. Martínez the passport more than a year before, he had been unable to use it on account of the prohibition of his prelate.[16]

"All these facts, Your Excellency, of which I have in my possession a detailed account drawn up by the very ones who were present, are notorious. Though it is not and cannot be my intention to give it the merit of legal evidence for judicial procedure against the caprice, despotism, and infraction of all divine, canonical, civil, and constitutional laws of which this comandante-general has been guilty against the venerable person of the Rev. Fr. Luis Martínez; nevertheless, Your Excellency, it seems to me sufficient for you to understand in what manner our habit and character are despised, and to infer the pressing need for the Supreme Government to take us under its powerful protection, supposing that we must continue in the sacred ministry here, which seems necessary lest these sheep be left without a shepherd.

"I do not know what strong motives the governor has had for such unheard-of infractions. The latter have been public, but the former are unknown. Yet I should not be surprised if he would persuade himself that the uprising at Monterey last November was not so much against himself as against the nation because of some connection with the Spanish flag,[17] so that under this specious pretext he could insinuate that we Missionary Fathers had provided the revolutionists with every assistance; but apart from the fact that the contrary is manifest from the very call to the revolt, all the missionaries refused to assist, and what was received was only obtained by means of force and violence,

---

[16] Fr. Prefecto Sarriá, who thus unwittingly gave Echeandía the opportunity to vent his spite on the Father.

[17] It had been claimed that Solís rebelled in the interest of Spain in order to receive aid from the friars. If so, he was disabused, for they refused either direct or indirect assistance, as was pointed out before.

as has happened to me. Who, after all, could be capable of such an illusion of thinking us guilty of disloyalty when we have always given proofs of the greatest fidelity to the territorial government? When the rebellion first broke out, and we knew not what its aim was, it was asserted that its object was a wholesale looting of all the missions perhaps with bloodshed. Can it be that the governor should want to make such dolts of us missionaries that we could not see how impolitic, how dangerous, and how impossible it was to make the least gesture in favor of Spain? At a time, too, when the majority of us are between fifty and seventy years of age, consequently near the grave, and having no more ardent wish than to arrive at this goal in peace and tranquillity? After having for so many years proved the contrary, is it not inflicting the greatest wrong on us to assert that we are in the mood of going about rebelling in favor of a power which can barely enjoy peacefully what it has before its eyes, much less a territory so distant that for many years, perhaps for centuries, it must necessarily be dependent upon Mexico? If on this point it is the intention to manufacture



Signature of Fr. Narciso Durán.

anything against the good opinion we enjoy, it seems it would be necessary to seize the most insipid and ridiculous charge imaginable. I should rather believe some one of the participators in the tumult either has tried to diminish his guilt by introducing some innocent person, or rather that the governor would want to persuade himself that he could thus discover the cause of the trouble where it is not, give a decent appearance to so many of his infractions of every law, and thus divert judicial attention from his own person. Be all this as it may, everything would be well if it had been done with due respect to the laws.

"I am very well aware, Most Excellent Sir, that this letter

is not a direct reply to the important communication of Your Excellency. I also see that in some way it is putting myself in the place of the prelate and head of the missionary body which at first sight does not seem becoming to a subject of less worth than any other.[18] All this is true, I acknowledge it herewith; but with your kind letter Your Excellency has opened the door so that I dared unbosom myself. You have given me the courage necessary to place before you our afflictions, and the danger of being treated with the same caprice and contempt inflicted upon our venerable brother, Fr. Luis, so that you may see that it is impossible that strength should not faint in seconding your ideas of public happiness, when on the border of life, and suffering from infirmities which for days render me useless.

"I then beg Your Excellency that, whilst you make yourself our judge and the kind protector of our helpless and defenceless state, you deign to be convinced that we cannot in honor continue to fulfill our sacred duties when, without any known reason, our habit, character, and sacred office have been treated with scorn. Such a procedure could not be expected from a Catholic government and nation. If Your Excellency, like an amiable father of the poor and helpless, for such indeed are we missionaries of Upper California, does not shield us with your powerful protection, (supposing that as heretofore without the least personal interest, solely out of pure charity for our neighbor, and in order not to abandon this poor flock, we continue to serve the Supreme Government in the persons of its subjects; and supposing that we should have to continue suffering so many vexations and exposed to all the insults of a military despotism without regard to the laws of justice), then I right now beg Your Excellency in your goodness to be pleased to supply a priest for my relief and a passport so that I may seek security in some other place, since we cannot promise it to ourselves

[18] Fr. Sánchez was the presidente at the time, but as he was not willing, and scarcely capable, to furnish a clear and complete view of the situation, the College probably advised the President of Mexico to honor Fr. Durán with the request for a full report.

here. I shall be grateful for this favor during the rest of my life; but if this is not possible, I offer in sacrifice my hearty good will and my love for Your Excellency to obey whatever commands it may please you to send me, and the zeal and energy to fulfill them as long as my strength may last. It will be the greatest honor and satisfaction which this your most humble and faithful servant may desire. Q. B. á V. E. L. M.[19] Mission San José in Alta California, May 10th, 1830. Fr. Narciso Durán. To the Most Excellent President of the United Mexican States." [20]

This letter of Fr. Durán no doubt hastened the removal of Echeandía and the arrival of Manuel Victoria as governor of Upper California. Before Bustamante had received Fr. Durán's communication he addressed another letter to the same Father. It is probably the one which he announced in his previous note to Fr. Durán, for it was dated April 3rd, 1830, and called for information and an expression of opinion on four points. What the President wanted to know was: 1—Fr. Durán's opinion regarding the stipends of the missionaries from the revenues of the Pious Fund? 2—What could be done to improve the natives materially and induce them to become private owners of land and cultivate the same? 3—Whether or not some of the Indians could be sent to Mexico to learn trades or to devote themselves to various arts? 4—Information on the commerce of the country? This official communication from the Mexican President reached Fr. Durán in September, a little more than a month after Echeandía and his California cabal consisting of five *paisanos* had adopted their decree of mission confiscation. The good Father's statement in reply is too long for reproduction. We shall therefore have to confine ourselves with giving the substance of this valuable document.

After many expressions of his unworthiness and inability the Father writes concerning the first point: "The missions

---

[19] "Who kisses Your Excellency's hands." A customary phrase among the Spaniards.

[20] "Santa Barbara Achives."

at present have no need of this assistance.[21] They have food and clothing of their own production. The missions and your administration would be the objects of supreme hatred here if you would send the least remittance before providing for the troops which for twenty years have lacked the necessaries and clothing for themselves and their families.[22] *It is almost a miracle, Your Excellency, to meet a soldier who wears a uniform.*[23] They are to an incredible degree disgusted with the service on account of the many years of suffering; and what torments them more is the suspicion, which they believe to be founded, that the little money which comes to the treasury is misapplied and squandered. The missions have not experienced such dearth. They have the necessary food and clothing as the fruit of their own harvests, and through the produce sold to the ships they supply the other necessaries. Hence Your Excellency must be convinced that the *first foundation* which Your Excellency should lay for building up this territory is *to pay the troops.* To that end you should try to find out the annual public income of the territory, and then forward what more is needed from Mexico. If Your Excellency does only this much, rest assured you will then have secured the love of this territory.

"On the second point, regarding the improvement of the neophytes, I have to say that, if at all times this has been the rock which has shipwrecked the best political talents and those most desirous of promoting the happiness of these poor people in whole America, it is more so in these missions

---

[21] This was magnanimous, for it meant declining the stipends due to the Fathers but which were always turned over to the mission fund. It does not refer to the half million dollars due from the government to the missions for supplies furnished the troops since 1811. The Fathers merely relinquished their own stipends of $400 a year for the sake of not rousing the jealousy of the neglected soldiery.

[22] During that period the troops and their families had subsisted, and they still subsisted, on what could be exacted from the missions.

[23] "Por milagro encuentra V. E. un soldado que tenga uniforme," i. e., they had no uniform for want of means to procure one. The italics are Fr. Durán's.

by reason of the invincible repugnance of the natives for civilization and the abandonment of their heathen notions. They are the children of an ancient inbred and absolute liberty which recognizes no authority or law. Hence their invincible inclination to a savage mode of life, notwithstanding the efforts of the missionaries, which on account of their intercourse with neighboring pagans they always have before their mind and cannot forget. This, I repeat, is a rock so formidable that it makes my hand tremble when I dwell on the subject of improving Indians on this line. Though I suppose that the intentions of Your Excellency's administration are to plant without rooting up and to build without destroying, I am almost thoroughly convinced that in this particular it is impossible to plant without rooting up and to build without tearing down. The Hon. Echeandía has attempted to make this improvement by emancipating a certain class of neophytes, so that they might work for themselves, become holders of personal property, and enjoy the full rights of citizens; but I believe he has been set aright in this attempt. Any way, neither politics nor morality have derived any advantage therefrom. It is in evidence that these emancipated neophytes pass the greater part of their life in indolence and drunkenness. Unfortunately his attempt has aroused a spirit of insubordination among those who remained in subjection. This spirit the missionaries can not remove either by means of a fatherly love, because it no more suffices, or by means of honorable ambition, because this to the Indians has no significance, or by means of excessive severity, because this does not become the leniency of an ecclesiastic. The neophytes are almost without exception and during their whole life like school children, who if left to themselves will quite certainly not profit thereby. If this is true in civilized countries, I leave it to the superior comprehension of Your Excellency what it must be with regard to these poor people whom the winning of honors does not impress, the advantage of gain from their personal labors does not interest, and who have no inclination save for an absolute independence without rational limits.

"It is true, the neophytes cultivate land, and do so in two ways: in common or each one for himself. It is a fact that in those who cultivate their fields individually there is observed a little more application and interest; but this is so because they are still attached to the mission community from which they receive the aid of oxen, plows, hoes, and whatever their work demands. However, if any one should wish to know what they would do if the mission community were dissolved, and the property and lands apportioned so that the Indians might become private owners like other citizens, I will say what appears evident to me and *to all who have no eye on a share in the spoliation.* It is this: Comparing the new mode of life, with its conventional needs in the matter of food and clothing according to civilized customs at the cost of labor, with their former pagan state in which they had no such conventional needs, and where without work nature spontaneously provided the little they needed; and comparing the immense difference between the political and rational liberty with the liberty enjoyed in the nomadic or savage life, we should conclude that in a short time they would eagerly return to their former unrestricted habits.

"From this Your Excellency might infer that the state of civilization and tutelage in missions and in communities is a forced and strained condition for the neophytes. It is such in some sense. Though the Indians receive Baptism voluntarily, yet, since their character is as changeable as it is childish, they easily weary and change so that for their perseverance paternal awe is necessary and sometimes imperative. This is a defect of their natural character which Your Excellency knows requires patience, time, and miracles to correct. This mission under my charge at present counts one hundred runaways, who are scattered along the rivers and in the Tulares. They have no other reason than their affection for their native districts. Only God can bring it about that they return to the Christian fold and rational life. One mission has four hundred such fugitives for the same reason. Your Excellency may gather from this what we should

have to fear from a general emancipation. It would amount to what I should call to plant by tearing out and to build by destroying.[24] I have heard that the legislative assembly, therefore, intends to change the condition of the neophytes gradually, beginning with the emancipation of two or three of the oldest and most advanced missions, and apportioning to their Indians the property and awaiting results before going further. This is a prudent plan. Slowness seems to me necessary here in order to avoid having to deplore evils which could not be remedied.

"The recital of so many difficulties and dangers attending any change in the condition of the neophytes will necessarily grieve the Christian heart of Your Excellency, and you will desire to know whether in the immense resources of the government there be not some way that overcomes all these difficulties. With very much confidence I say that there is such a way, which in a short time will lead to prosperity not only for the neophytes, but for all the inhabitants of this territory, as I have set forth in the biennial report for 1826.[25] It is very plain and simple. Let twenty young and exemplary missionaries come here, and let the troops of the four presidios receive their pay. Then let a new chain of missions and presidios be established to the east of the coast range mountains. Then let the neophytes choose between joining the new missions and receiving their share of the present mission property with all the rights of citizenship like the white people, and forming civilized towns or ranchos. Finally, let the surplus land be divided among settlers in order to encourage colonization.[26] In this way the present neo-

[24] That is to say, the neophytes would all fall back into paganism and barbarism.

[25] Fr. Durán, "Informe Bienal," April 10th, 1827. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[26] Here again is proof positive that the friars were not opposed to colonization, but they wanted it brought about in a lawful and considerate manner. The Indians were the lawful owners of the land. They must not be dispossessed against their will nor without full compensation. What they might not need, Fr. Durán insinuates, could be ceded with their consent. Fr. Durán really went

phytes or prospective citizens would be prevented from relapsing into savagery and paganism, because the missions to the east would gather in the rest of the pagans, and the neophytes would be constrained either to lead a civilized life in their pueblos or be returned to the tutelage of the new chain of missions, since there would be no room for a nomadic life.

"From all this Your Excellency can infer what I would have to say on the third point, i. e., sending neophytes to Mexico to learn arts or sciences. I find in them no ambition or interest that would stimulate them. Moreover the displeasure and anxiety of the relatives would have to be greatly feared; for the change of climate would in some of the apprentices bring about death, or deep melancholy to which they are inclined would set in and would embitter them for being so far away from their relatives.

"With regard to commerce, the fourth point about which Your Excellency requests information, I must say that I know very little about it. In order to obey I venture to propose, that for the encouragement of commerce it appears that one should begin by removing the obstacles and inconveniences that frighten away foreign ships. As it is they sometimes run up and down the coast for two years before they can dispose of their goods. . . .

"The products exported from this territory at present are but two: tallow and hides. The former has much declined and is taken only in order to obtain the hides for which there is a good sale. This branch is capable of an increase of fifty per cent., and will be realized if the plan of a new chain of missions and the allotment of lands is carried out. Besides this there is nothing of moment exported except a little soap. If wheat were more extensively cultivated, mills established, and machinery introduced as they have in the States of Northern Mexico, the territory could have the exclusive trade in flour along the whole Pacific coast."

---

more than half way to conciliate the covetous paisanos; but they were not open to reason. They wanted absolute control of the whole mission property. To that end the missionaries must first be removed. Hence the slanders against the friars.

Fr. Durán then advocates the separation of the government of Lower California from that of Upper California. He attributes the Solís revolt to the fact that the governor was too far away from Monterey.[27] In reply to the question of the Mexican President as to what would contribute to the peace of the territory, Fr. Durán writes: "Two things seem to me to lead directly to this end. The first is that the governors should be enjoined not to undertake any innovation of importance until they have gone over the whole territory under their command and have seen it with their own eyes. To do otherwise is to act like a blind man with the risk of having to regret it afterwards, as was the case with the premature emancipation of a certain class of Indians which has produced nothing but disorder and vice among the so privileged, and insubordination among the rest.

"The other thing is that provision should be made for a seminary for the education of young men who feel inclined towards the ecclesiastical state. The candidates should be recruited from the native youths of the territory, so that there be no need of having them come from abroad which is always accompanied with much hardship and little success.[28] Only in this manner, it seems to me, can these settlements be provided with spiritual nourishment. It is plain, however, that such a seminary cannot prosper save under the eye of one who is clothed with episcopal dignity. Therefore I think it

[27] Echeandía had jurisdiction over both Californias, but resided at San Diego as a rule. Fr. Durán is kindly attributing the revolt to this circumstance; but it was not the only one, nor the chief one.

[28] That is to say, it was costly and few responded. Fr. Durán erred through kindness by attributing more religiousness to the Californians than they possessed. Vocations to the priesthood cannot be looked for in sufficient numbers save where well instructed practical Catholicity flourishes. Hence it was that only two native Californians were ordained down to the year 1860 and much later, despite the presence of a bishop: Rev. José Ignacio Argüello, son of Governor José Dario Argüello, born at San Gabriel in 1781, and Rev. José de los Santos Ávila, born at Monterey about twenty years later. The Rev. Ávila died at Santa Clara in 1846, the night before he was to celebrate his first holy Mass. Libro de Entierros, Santa Clara.

is time to petition for the erection of this territory into a diocese and the appointment of a bishop to govern it. Then with the new chain of missions, and with the provisions made for the maintenance of the troops, the spiritual and temporal prosperity of the territory would be insured. Mission San José, September 23rd, 1830. Fr. Narciso Durán." [29]

This correspondence between the President of Mexico and Fr. Narciso Durán clearly shows: first, the good will of the Franciscans to satisfy the mission enemies as far as was possible without prejudice to the rights of the neophytes; secondly, the absolute disinterestedness of the friars in that they were willing to surrender their places to any legitimate substitutes, and to undertake anew the burdensome task of Christianizing and civilizing the savages east of the mountains with the prospect of again being driven out; thirdly, the friendly disposition of the Bustamante administration in that it sought a means to do justice to the neophytes and the missionaries; and fourthly, the confidence placed in the friars by the Mexican President rather than in the obstreperous Echeandía and *paisano* clique. This latter point is especially noteworthy for the fact that the previous administration had opposed Fr. Durán's reappointment, and that Echeandía had determined to banish him, as was well known at the capital.

We may furthermore conclude that between themselves Bustamante and Fr. Durán would have devised a means of taking from the Californians every reasonable excuse for their violent opposition to the missions, and the latter might have been saved, though with less acreage, after the manner perhaps observed by the United States in dealing with the Indians under its jurisdiction. Indian tribes which possessed more land than they could cultivate or utilize were and are induced to sell a portion of their domain in order to make room for white settlers. It is not probable that this just arrangement would have silenced the *paisanos;* for they wanted to enrich themselves without going through the trouble of clearing, irrigating and cultivating numerous stretches of unused land outside the missions. Hence they insisted on con-

[29] "Sta. Barbara Archives."

fiscation, the wicked custom in vogue among Latin and German nations as we observe wherever the intolerant and godless Liberals obtain control. At all events, the conservative government of Mexico intended to bring peace to the territory, and found it would succeed justly and more quickly by dealing with the missionaries rather than by trusting the officials in California.

CHAPTER III.

Echeandía Removed.—Manuel Victoria Appointed.—Echeandía's Trickery.—He Proclaims the "Secularization" of the Missions.—Bancroft on the Young Californians and on Echeandía's Action.—Efforts of the Californians to Seduce the Indians.—Bancroft on Echeandía's Scheme.—Victoria Revokes Echeandía's Decree.—Victoria and Padrés.—Victoria Exonerates the Missionaries.—Religious Principles of the Young Californians.—Victoria Accuses Padrés of Treason.—Rage of Padrés and His Young Partisans.—Victoria Endeavors to Restore Order.—Sends Padrés out of the Country.—Hittell and Bancroft on Governor Victoria.

THE removal of Echeandía from the office of governor had been contemplated in Mexico for some time. Only three years after his arrival in California he was notified that Lieutenant José Maria Padrés, who had come with him to Lower California in 1825 and was then ayudante inspector on the peninsula, would take his place as governor. Owing to the disorders at the capital the change had not been effected. Padrés arrived at San Diego in July 1830, but in the meantime President Bustamante of Mexico separated the two Californias. On March 8th he appointed Lieutenant-Colonel Manuel Victoria governor of Upper California and Mariano Monterde governor of the peninsula. Padrés remained in Upper California as ayudante inspector.[1]

After his appearance at San Diego, "the new inspector, José Maria Padrés," says Robinson, an eyewitness, "pretending to take much interest in bettering the condition of the natives, soon commenced a work of destruction under the name of reform. The act of secularization of the missions

---

[1] J. A. Facio, Minister of War, to Echeandía, March 8th, 1830: "Avisa que el dia 8 de Marzo nombró el Presidente al Ten. Coronel Manuel Victoria gefe politico de Alta California."—"Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap. vi, 152. Alamán to Echeandía, March 11th, 1830, writes that Victoria is named gefe politico, and that he should turn over the office to the appointee. Ibidem 162. Bancroft, iii, 54; Hittell, ii, 122. See also vol. i, this work, 590; 624.

was now put in force." The result was that "in some of the missions the Indians abandoned their labor, and, when chastised, insulted the priests. These flourishing institutions, as they had been, were in danger of immediate subversion and ruin. Through the encouragement of Echeandía, vice of all kinds became prevalent, and the poor misguided Indians saw in the terms *libre* and *independente* a sort of license for the indulgence of every passion."[2] To remove the blame from himself, Padrés complained to the Mexican Government that the recent troubles in California resulted from the bad example and the bad teachings of the Spaniards and Spanish missionaries; that an attempt had been made to remedy the evil in part by ordering the Fr. Prefect Sarriá, who had refused to take the oaths, to leave the country; that the people and the troops had opposed the measure; and that the laws for the expulsion of the Spaniards had not been carried out, etc. The new governor, in addition to the general instructions, received orders from the Mexican Government, dated October 6th, 1830, to investigate these charges.[3]

Victoria from Loreto wrote to Echeandía that he desired to meet him at San Diego, and then proceeded on his journey to the north. Arriving in December or possibly late in November, he was much disappointed at not finding Echeandía there nor a message from him. He therefore despatched a courier to the territorial capital who elicited the reply that the incumbent would transfer his office at Monterey.[4] A later despatch named Santa Barbara. Evidently the wily official was sparring for delay. The reason became known as soon as Victoria had reached Santa Barbara. Instead of Echeandía, to his amazement, a proclamation arrived which declared all the missions of California "secularized." It had been issued at Monterey on January 6th, 1831, long after the notification to turn the office over to his successor who was

[2] "Life in California," San Francisco, 1891, p. 108.

[3] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Govt. St. Pap. vi, 242-244.

[4] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. viii, 555. Echeandía to Victoria, Nov. 22nd, 1830. Victoria to Echeandía, from Santa Barbara, January 14th, 1831. "Cal. Arch.," Mis. and Colon. ii, 118-119.

within the territory. The author prefaced his decree with some high-sounding remarks on the rights of man in general and of the Indian in particular, and justified his action especially with the much abused decree of the Spanish Córtes of September 13th, 1813, which had no binding force in the republic, and which after all, as we have seen, never contemplated anything like the change which the proclamation announced. Echeandía furthermore declared that the plan of emancipation in particuler cases, which had been tried, had resulted in great evils, as well to the individuals emancipated as to the community at large.[5] The neophytes, however, were very much discontented,[6] and therefore the missionary system ought not to last longer. Consequently, and in view of the action of the legislative assembly which had approved it,[7] he decreed and ordered his plan of "secularization" to be carried into effect.[8]



Signature of José M. de Echeandía.

Echeandía would not rest satisfied with issuing a proclamation enforcing his decree of confiscation, but six days later, January 10th, instructed Lieutenant Zamorano to aid in con-

[5] Nevertheless he would now emancipate them all!

[6] This was untrue with the large majority, as will appear later; and where it applied it was due to the machinations of Echeandía and Padrés.

[7] Subject to the consent of the General Government, which so far had not sanctioned the plan, and later rejected it.

[8] "Sta. Barb. Arch."; "Cal. Arch.," Mis. and Colon. ii, 120-128; 191-200; Dep. Rec. ix, 150-168.

verting Mission San Gabriel into a pueblo, and to supervise the distribution of the lots and shares. At the same time he gave similar directions to Inspector Padrés with regard to Mission San Carlos.[9] The messenger bearing the despatch concerning San Gabriel had to pass the real governor, Victoria, at Santa Barbara. This shows what desperate steps the ex-governor was prepared to take in order to accomplish his scheme of plunder. Although Echeandía and his fellow conspirators were blind to the damage which the decree would inflict on the very troops, Comandante Argüello of San Diego foresaw the disastrous effect. He accordingly wrote to Echeandía that the status of San Gabriel Mission must not be changed, because the supplies which the mission furnished were absolutely necessary for the troops at San Diego.[10] This was also true of the other missions, but it seems the conspirators in their eagerness to gratify their greed would not brook delay. What might be the fate of the neophytes, the owners of the property coveted, caused them no worry. For the Indians it should be enough to see themselves "free."

This then is the explanation of Echeandía's strange conduct in delaying the transfer of command, and it also discloses the cause of the bitter controversy which now began between the new ruler and prominent California schemers under the guidance of Padrés and Echeandía. "There was a popular[11] feeling," says Bancroft, "in favor of the proposed changes far in advance of Echeandía's personal views, and largely due to the influence of José Maria Padrés, the newly-arrived ayudante-inspector. Padrés soon became a leading spirit among the young Californians just becoming prominent in public life, intensified their nascent republicanism, taught them to theorize eloquently on the rights of man, the wrongs of the neophytes, and the tyranny of the missionaries; and if

[9] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. ix, 172.

[10] Argüello to Echeandía, January 21st, 1831. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. iii, 9-14.

[11] Only among those who expected to gain thereby. Bancroft names them.

he also held up before the eyes of the Carrillos, Osios, Vallejos, Picos, Alvarados, Bandinis, and others bright visions of rich estates to be administered by them or their friends, their young enthusiasm should by no means be termed hypocrisy or a desire for plunder! Yet events in Mexico seemed to favor the friars, and were not encouraging to the views of Padrés and his disciples; but when the day of Victoria's arrival drew near, and no approval of the plan came from Mexico,[12] Echeandía was persuaded, probably without much difficulty, to essay a *golpe de estado*. He accordingly on January 6th, 1831, issued a decree of secularization, which he took immediate steps to carry into execution before turning over the command to his successor. Victoria was known to be more of a soldier than a politician, and it was hoped with the aid of the diputacion in some way to sustain the decrees and reach a result favorable to the anti-mission party. *Echeandía's act was wholly illegal, uncalled for, and unwise. It was simply a trick, and an absurd one.*[13] The opponents of Victoria were thus in the wrong at the beginning of the quarrel." [14]

"In the north the proclamation was more or less fully published. The document with the proper instructions and requests was sent not only to local officials, but to the padre prefecto and the bishop, who were urged to instruct and prepare the friars for the change.[15] The ayuntamiento or town council of Monterey on the 8th of January chose a comisionado for each of the seven missions of the district.[16]

---

[12] The majority in Congress had rejected it. In the next clause Bancroft plainly expresses his belief that Echeandía merely executed the will of the young California clique. We are very strongly of the same opinion.

[13] The italics are ours.

[14] Bancroft, iii, 184-185.

[15] The bishop on March 22nd, 1831, replied that he had no curates to spare. Bancroft, iii, 308.

[16] What jurisdiction the town council of Monterey had over the seven missions is hard to see. Those chosen were J. B. Alvarado for San Luis Obispo, José Castro for San Miguel, Antonio Castro

José Castro and J. B. Alvarado were sent to San Miguel and San Luis Obispo respectively, where they read the decree and made speeches to the assembled neophytes. At San Luis Obispo, and probably at all the missions of the district, the comisarios were elected; but at San Miguel, after listening to the orators, the neophytes expressed a very decided preference for the padre and the old system. The Indians said they respected the government and the decree, but by reason of their poverty and ignorance they desired no change.[17] Alvarado, as he himself narrates, here mounted a cart in the mission courtyard, where he vividly pictured the advantages of freedom to the Indians. Then he requested those who wished to remain under the padre to stand on the left, and those preferring freedom to go to the right. Nearly all went to the left at first, where they were soon joined by the small minority. Alvarado also says that the Indians at San Luis Obispo and San Antonio expressed the same views."[18] On account of Governor Victoria's arrival the matter went no further.

Thus it is clear that Echeandía with Padrés and a clique of young Californians had determined to carry out the confiscation of the missions against the wishes of the Indians, without the consent of the Federal Government, and despite the presence of the newly-appointed governor. One of the reasons for his haste in the matter Echeandía revealed to Figueroa two years later. It was that he knew the Zacatecan Franciscans, all Mexicans, were coming by order of the government, and that it was as important to prevent their succession to the temporal administration as to secure their suc-

---

for San Antonio, Tibúrcio Castro for Soledad, Juan Higuera for San Juan Bautista, Sebastian Rodríguez for Santa Cruz, and Manuel Crespo for San Carlos. Bancroft, iii, 307.

[17] "Cal. Arch.," Dept. St. Pap. iii, 15-16; 19; Dep. Rec. ix, 194.

[18] Bancroft, iii, 307-308. The Indians then must have received kind treatment from the friars, and the charges of cruelty must be false, otherwise the neophytes would have seized the opportunity to "free" or "emancipate" themselves. The Indians had good reason to distrust the tempters.

JUAN B. ALVARADO VAINLY HARANGUES THE INDIANS OF SAN MIGUEL.

cession to the spiritual management.[19] Yet, though "the territorial government, as Echeandía well knew," Bancroft affirms, "had no power to secularize the missions, a decree of secularization was issued January 6th, 1831. *It was an illegal and even revolutionary measure,* devised by José Maria Padrés in supposed furtherance of his own interests or radical theories, and those of a few friends. Had it been accomplished some months earlier, there might have been a plausible hope on the part of Padrés and his party for success; but now, when Victoria was already in California, *it was a most absurd and aimless scheme.*" [20]

While at Santa Barbara the new governor endeavored to prevent the publication of the audacious bando and decree in the south, and on January 19th reported the situation to the General Government. Enclosing a copy of the two documents, Victoria denounced Padrés as the real author of the scheme for "secularizing" the missions, and declared that the territorial assembly had been induced by means of intrigue to approve it. Some of the provisions, he reported, apparently favored the neophytes, but in reality they were absolutely ridiculous and impracticable. Any one could detect the atrocious objects of the authors, inasmuch as under the regulations of the decree only a meagre portion of the land and property would go to the neophytes, whilst the bulk of the valuable temporalities would be at the disposition of administrators. It was in truth, he said, a scheme of spoliation, by means of which favorites would be benefited, and many years' labor and the substance of the missionaries as well as of the Indians would be wasted. Victoria furthermore insisted that Padrés should be removed from the country. At all events energetic measures should be taken to avoid the evils which Padrés and his confederates had already brought upon the territory.[21]

Convinced that Echeandía would not surrender the office at Santa Barbara, the new governor went to Monterey. He

[19] Bancroft, iii, 303.

[20] Bancroft, iii, 304-305. The italics are ours.

[21] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap. viii, 164-167.

there on January 31st took the oath and assumed control of the territorial government.[22] In a proclamation issued the next day he advised the people of his purpose to promote the public welfare, and expressed the hope of receiving the cordial support of all the inhabitants. The laws, he said, must be executed, the government obeyed, and the institutions of the country respected.[23]

Victoria's first administrative act was a proclamation, published on the same February 1st, 1831, declaring that he suspended the execution of Echeandía's decree of "secularization" because it was not in accordance with the will of the Supreme Government.[24] To the alcalde of San José, apparently Mariano Duarte, who seems to have shown signs of disregard, he wrote on the same date: "The proclamation of the 6th of January last, converting the missions into pueblos, not being in conformity with the wish of the Supreme Government, I warn you to suspend operations until I shall determine what is best." [25] Robinson, an eye-witness, also notes Victoria's efforts to undo the mischief of the ex-governor. "As soon as he received the command from Echeandía," he writes, "his first step was to counteract the ruinous effects of the imprudence of his predecessor, and to restore the missions to their former state." [26]

Victoria next wrote to the Central Government that he had found the affairs of the territory in a worse condition than he had anticipated; and that, for the purpose of preventing future machinations of Padrés, he had despatched that official to San Francisco with the view of sending him out of the

---

[22] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. ix, 208.

[23] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., San José iv, 407.

[24] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., San José iv, 406.

[25] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., San José iv, 408. On March 7th, 1831, Victoria sent out a circular to the commanders of the presidios, that in consideration of the scarcity of supplies at the missions, the latter will furnish only what they can."—"Que atendido á la escasez de las misiones solo suministran lo que puedan." "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. ix, 12.

[26] Robinson, "Life in California," 108.

country at the first opportunity. He also reported that the territorial deputation had been reduced, and that for this reason he would not call that body together until he had received instructions to that effect.[27]

The repeated demands of some legislators for a call of the territorial assembly brought out from the governor an address to the public in which Victoria in a straightforward manner defined his position, alluded to the criminal motives and seditious plans of the opposing faction, whom he accused of being moved by personal interests disguised in the habiliments of philanthropy, and declared his intention of thwarting the schemes of Echeandía. He further stated that a majority of the diputados had been illegally elected, and that he had reported everything to the National Government, without whose orders he would not convoke the assembly.[28]

Under the circumstances this attitude of the new governor was quite correct, and even imperative for his own safety as for the peace of the inhabitants. There was nothing calling for urgent action on the part of the assembly anyway. Hittell and others, like their young California clients, protest that the law demanded such meeting of the legislators. True, but, the deputies were bent on embarrassing the governor and causing disturbance among the people. To report the situation to the Supreme Government for instructions, was therefore a wise move. If imbued with patriotic motives, the members of the assembly could well afford to await the decision from Mexico; but that is just what they desired to avoid, since they felt that their iniquitous designs would not be sanctioned. Hence their subsequent turbulence, and their clamors for obedience to the law. Yet it was not the execution of the laws which concerned the Californians and their advisers, Echeandía and Padrés, but the removal of the obstacles to attaining the success of their plots against the missions; for there were a number of laws which protected the Indian's property rights which the schemers determined to overthrow. This is the conclusion which Bancroft himself

[27] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap. viii, 229-232.

[28] Victoria, "Manifiesto," September 21st, 1831.

draws from the acts of the plotters. "I have no doubt," he says, "the plan was in some manner to insist, with the aid of the diputacion, on the carrying-out of the secularization scheme." [29]

That the new governor honestly strove to promote the welfare of the territory, and that he desired to be guided in his efforts by the Supreme Government, his anxiety to keep the President of the republic informed of every step he took clearly demonstrates. Thus on September 21st, 1831, Victoria reported that he had prevented the execution of the plan of "secularization" and so foiled the ambitious projects of its authors, but that Echeandía, Padrés, and their friends were still actively intriguing to accomplish their infamous purposes. They were secretly corresponding with one another with a view to bring the territorial deputation together, and by its means to drive him from office in order to carry out their plans. So far he had been able to thwart their schemes, but they were seducing the people and even the neophyte Indians of the missions. He knew that Mariano Vallejo, José Sanchez, J. V. Alvarado, and José Castro were in accord on the subject, and that the confederates would stop at nothing to effect their malicious designs. Victoria also complained that there were few, if any, persons in California fit to be alcaldes, and that the offices were sought mainly for purposes of personal gain or revenge.[30]

Long before this date, February 7th, the governor had investigated Padrés's charges against the missionaries. The result was that he informed the Supreme Government that he had seen Fr. Vicente de Sarriá, the comisario-prefecto of the friars; that he had received from him an exposition of the prelate's sentiments and the reason for his conduct, and that

---

[29] Bancroft, "California," iii, 187.

[30] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. ix, 373-375. "All Victoria's official papers read well. He handled the pen with ability," says Hittell, ii, 134. "All this officer's communications were brief and to the point, showing the writer to be more of a soldier than a politician, and lacking of the usual Mexican bombast," Bancroft tells us in vol. iii, p. 185.

he considered the Father entirely exonerated. Fr. Sarriá, he reported, had grown old, was a man of great intelligence, honesty, and culture, and incapable of sedition. It was not he nor the missionaries who had caused trouble, but Padrés and his evil-minded confederates. They had called religious observances fanaticism,[31] and had even attempted to throw ridicule upon his own respect for the laws of the Church.[32] During the Solís revolt Echeandía and his friends had accused the missionaries with taking part in the rebellion and with conspiring to raise the Spanish flag; but the truth was that Fr. Sarriá and his fellow missionaries had opposed Solís, and had exerted their influence in behalf of the government. The mission enemies had charged Fr. Martínez with complicity in the Solís uprising, and Echeandía had banished him; but there was no doubt that in this action there had been precipitation and oppression. They had charged the missionaries with bad conduct, and especially with treasonable sentiments, whereas the very missionaries thus accused had taken the oath of independence, and, though they had refused to swear to the constitution of Mexico, they had always been obedient to the government and complied with all its institutions.[33]

Seven months later, September 14th, Victoria reported to the Minister of War that he had permitted Padrés to visit the northern frontier and to inspect the Russian post, but that he regretted it; for Padrés's visit had resulted in bad

---

[31] Characteristic of the young Californians who deemed themselves above religious precepts for having tasted a little French infidel philosophy. Fervor and fidelity in the service of the Creator is fanaticism with those only who despise His precepts.

[32] Typical of those who "emancipate" themselves from divine and ecclesiastical laws. Ridicule is their stock in trade. Victoria respected the laws of his Church, and therefore the laws of God. Hence he also respected property rights, and was determined to protect the property of the mission Indians. That was the capital crime in the eyes of his opponents.

[33] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap. viii, 198-204; Hittell, ii, 130. The missionaries might well rest satisfied with this splendid vindication which accords strictly with the facts.

consequences. Padrés had pictured to the Russian comandante the condition of the Californians as wretched and horrible. He had represented the writer (Victoria) as a despot, and the priests in charge of the missions as fanatics and tyrants, who oppressed the Indians with the most cruel and galling slavery;[34] and he had not hesitated to accuse the Supreme Government itself, so that he (the governor) felt satisfied that the Russians, through Padrés's treasonable disclosures, had learned much about the internal affairs of the territory.[35]

The rage of Padrés and his confederates at finding themselves baffled in their designs on the mission temporalities may be imagined. Echeandía, who instead of leaving the territory had remained at San Diego, declared that the devil had prompted Victoria to prevent the publication of the decree in the south and afterwards to nullify it in the north.[36] What added fuel to the hatred which the Padrés conspirators had enkindled among the *paisanos* against the governor was Victoria's strict ideas of discipline and the severe punishments he inflicted. He was said to have boasted that before long he would make it safe for any man to leave his handkerchief or his watch lying in the plaza of Monterey until he might choose to come for it.[37]

Hittell especially tries hard to make Victoria appear cruel and arbitrary in the few executions ordered during his short term. That of course was the claim of Padrés and his following; but, inasmuch as the victims had been found guilty

---

[34] Here we have another source of the brutal and unwarranted accusations repeated against the friars in many so-called histories, notably Hittell's.

[35] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. Rec. ix, 373-375. This action of Padrés is not surprising. The Benedict Arnolds and similar traitors are invariably found among those who decry priests and religious as disloyal. History everywhere is in evidence.

[36] Bancroft, iii, 307 Echeandía being still military commander, retired to San Diego, and Padrés went to San Francisco where he remained sowing seeds of discord and discontent among the inhabitants. Robinson, "Life in California," 109.

[37] Bancroft, iii, 189-190.

after a searching trial, and Assessor Rafael Gómez recommended capital punishment, it is difficult to see where the governor failed in his duty to society if order was to be restored and respect for the law inculcated. The truth is, if Victoria had only permitted the spoliation of the missions, his enemies would have been perfectly satisfied.

The governor, who justly regarded José M. Padrés as the leading spirit in the opposition, and whom in all his communications to the government he named as the cause of the country's present troubles, at last resolved to rid California of the fomenter of discontent. The order for his banishment was issued in October, and early in November he was put on board a vessel for San Blas.[38] This action against the arch-conspirator only hastened the determination of the other plotters to proceed against the missions and against their protector. That Victoria described his enemies correctly when he reported them to the government as capable of stopping at nothing in order to drive him out of the territory, is evident from their proceedings after they had discovered that he could not be utilized to further covetous plans. Hittell, who, as an enemy of the missionaries on general principles, takes up the defence of the Picos, Bandinis, Vallejos, and especially of his client Alvarado, cannot help acknowledging that Victoria was firmly persuaded that what he did was right. "He was active and energetic. He was firm and reliable. He was courageous and brave. His offences were the fault rather of a narrow and bad education than of a perverse heart."[39] Not one of the good qualities enumerated can be attributed to his young California opponents, least of all that of not having a perverse heart.

Bancroft, who went deeper into the records, and who knew the most of the prominent mission despoilers, makes little effort to conceal his contempt for their general character and particularly for their veracity. With regard to the governor, however, he writes: "Victoria was personally brave, honest, energetic, straightforward, and devoted to what he deemed

[38] Bancroft, iii, 197; Robinson, 109.

[39] Hittell, ii, 142.

the best interest of the territory . . . ; but the trick that was attempted by Padrés and Echeandía, and formidable opposition, forced him to a more arbitrary [40] policy than he would otherwise have shown, and which was not to be defended even by the promptness and frankness with which he submitted all to the national authorities. . . . Under other circumstances Victoria might have been one of California's best rulers. . . . The Californians have weakened their cause by their unfounded and exaggerated attacks on Victoria's personal character. . . ." As to "the foreign residents,[41] they were silent. David Spence [42] merely says that Victoria was energetic and made every one respect order and law, which did not please a certain class; but I suspect that their views were more favorable to the governor than they cared to admit generally to the strong element opposing him." [43]

---

[40] If Victoria acted with full knowledge of the Central Government, as Bancroft concedes, it is strange that his acts should be termed arbitrary and indefensible. The lawless condition of the territory brought about by the unscrupulous Echeandía demanded stern and repressive measures. All but the leading paisanos seem to have been satisfied.

[41] Mostly English and American traders. With regard to Victoria's treatment of Abel Stearns we refer the reader to Bancroft, iii, 193-194, as the case has no bearing on our subject and Bancroft endeavors to be fair.

[42] He was a highly respected Scotch resident of Monterey, who became prominent in public life, and was noted for his conservatism.

[43] Bancroft, iii, 198-200; 212.

CHAPTER IV.

Real Motive of Opposition to Victoria.—Pronunciamento of the Conspirators.—Victoria Goes to Meet Them.—His Imprudence.—His Fearlessness.—Dangerously Wounded.—Resigns and Departs.—Echeandía Again.—The Legislative Assembly.—Three Governors at Once, then Two.—Two Memorials.—Grandiloquent Vallejo.—The Bustamante Administration.—Views of the Missionaries Demanded.—Replies of Fathers Cabot, Jimeno, and Sánchez.—Fr. Sarriá's Letter.—Bancroft on Fr. Durán's Commentaries.

"INTERESTED parties," says Fr. Narcisco Durán, "among whom were some members of the territorial assembly, sure of their prey,[1] were disappointed, and disappointment turned into hatred for the equitable Victoria. Never had they forgiven this just governor for having rescued the booty already within their grasp. They sought to force him to convene the assembly, in order that with a semblance of legality they might accomplish their desires, ungrateful for the sacrifices of the poor Indians; but Victoria never consented. In November therefore they proclaimed a plan of attack." [2]

Here as in a nutshell the Fr. Presidente of the missions exposes the true inwardness of the bitter hostility to Governor Victoria. The mission temporalities were the real bone of contention. Everything else that the conspirators broached against Victoria only served to arouse the passions and to mask the real sentiments. The Padrés and Pico crowd had stood so near the coveted goal that it exasperated them beyond bounds to see the governor manfully place himself in the way. Hence it was that one November night at San Diego Pio Pico, his brother-in-law Juan Antonio Carrillo,

---

[1] That is to say, the missions.

[2] Fr. Durán, "Epilogue" to his "Notas" on Echeandía's decree, December 31st, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

and Juan Bandini,[3] resolved on rebellion.[4] At their request the irrepressible Echeandía put himself at the head of the movement. The soldiers of the presidio readily joined him, but the officers, especially Pablo de la Portilla and Santiago Argüello, showed considerable reluctance. All finally promised active co-operation against their chief officer, the governor of California. The three arch-plotters on November 29th, 1831, drew up a Pronunciamento or insurrectionary address to the "Mexican Citizens Residing in Upper California." It was signed by Pio Pico, Juan Bandini, and José Antonio Carrillo. On December 1st a supplement was added to justify the conduct of the San Diego troops, and signed by José Echeandía, Captain Pablo de la Portilla, Santiago Argüello, José Maria Ramírez, Ignácio del Valle, Juan José Rocha, and, as comandante of the artillery detachment, Sergeant Andrés Cervantes, besides the three principals already mentioned.[5]

In the Pronunciamento proper,[6] which is of a piece with similar effusions of revolters in Latin America to the present day, the three leading conspirators assure the people that "the Supreme Being,[7] who possesses our hearts, knows the

[3] Born at Lima, Perú, in 1800; lived in California since about 1820.

[4] Bancroft, iii, 200; Hittell, ii, 138.

[5] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 523-566; Bancroft, iii, 200-204; Hittell, ii, 139.

[6] "Ciudadanos Mejicanos situados en el Alto Territorio de las Californias . . . contra un tirano que seguramente bajo el aspecto de la hipocrisia ha engañado á los Supremos Poderes, etc."—"The reader who may have the patience to examine this state paper," Bancroft contemptuously remarks, "will find in it a good many words. It was apparently the production of Bandini." Bancroft, iii, 203-204. As it is but bombast, worthy of the overgrown boys who concocted it, we think it sufficient to touch only two points to show the animus.

[7] This expression alone stamps the leaders as disciples of the French infidel notions fathered by the unspeakable Voltaire. The Creator, to these disturbers, was only a superior or supreme being among all beings, to whom they need not hold themselves accountable. No wonder they displayed such remarkable principles of morality in their private lives, not to speak of their public ca-

pure sentiments with which we set out."[8] As no valid cause for a revolution existed, in view of the fact that the governor had left everything to the decision of the Supreme Government, and the revolters could have appealed to the same government for redress and awaited a reply, the taking of Almighty God to witness was nothing less than blasphemy and hypocrisy. They had complained that Victoria disobeyed the law, in that he would not convene the territorial assembly until the Supreme Government so directed, and now they themselves break a more important law, in that they have recourse to arms against their legitimate ruler for no other reason than personal spite and hatred. The conspirators, indeed, felt that their past conduct justified grave suspicions of their sincerity, and therefore they expressly disavow any design on the missions, because "to the Supreme Government belongs exclusively the power to dictate what it may deem proper on the subject, and they promise the Fathers to observe respect, decorum, and security of the property intrusted to their care." If it pertained to the Supreme Government to decide what should be done with the missions, why then did Echeandía and these same revolters pass the decree of confiscation, miscalled secularization, without the sanction of the Supreme Government? By this simple statement the conspirators unwittingly remove every excuse for their turbulence and final rebellion. Had they practiced a year before what they now lay down as the right and privilege of the Supreme Government, their present protestations would have had some value, and Victoria would not have found himself compelled to countermand their decree of spoliation.

---

reer. Hittell tries to veil the spirit of his clients by translating "Omnipotence," but the original is "Ser Supremo," an infidel expression never used by faithful Christians, least of all by Catholics.

[8] If God had possessed their hearts they would have obeyed His dictates, and then there would have been no revolt. The reader will observe that the young rebels had learned the base art of hoodwinking to perfection. Yet they accused Victoria of "hipocrisia"!

Meanwhile the governor had been warned by letters from friends in the south that a plot was brewing against him. For the purpose of quelling any disturbance he therefore set out from Monterey with Ensign Rodrigo del Pliego and only ten or twenty men. At Santa Barbara with difficulty José de la Guerra and Captain Romualdo Pacheco persuaded the fearless Victoria to increase his little force. Pacheco and a dozen soldiers were at last permitted to join him, so that his entire command consisted of not more than thirty men. This was a grave error; but the governor, knowing the character of the conspirators, expected no fight, or more probably counted on the aid of Comandante Portilla of San Diego, of whose treachery he had as yet heard nothing.[9] Portilla with one hundred and fifty or more rebels left Los Angeles on December 5th, and met the governor's little troop a few miles outside the town. Not heeding the overwhelming numbers, Victoria, followed by Pacheco and his men, rushed upon the opposing forces. In the encounter which ensued Pacheco was killed, and the governor received several dangerous wounds which disabled him. On the side of the rebels José M. Ávila was killed and a few men were wounded. Portilla and his valiant men thereupon ran away. Pico, Echeandía, and Bandini had remained behind. Victoria's men bore the wounded governor to Mission San Gabriel. Had it not been for his wounds, Bancroft says, the governor would have retaken Los Angeles without difficulty; and it is by no means unlikely that he would have crushed the rebellion altogether. As it was, Victoria lay at San Gabriel in danger of death attended by Surgeon Joseph Chapman, whilst with two or three exceptions his men deserted him. There was then no possibility of further resistance. When out of danger he sent for Echeandía, and, after an interview with him on December 9th, resigned the command to his adversary. About December 20th, sufficiently restored to make the trip, he departed

[9] Bancroft thinks that Portilla was compelled to join the rebels under threats, and that he did no fighting.

for Mission San Luis Rey, and on January 17th, 1832, sailed for Mexico in the American ship *Pocahontas*.[10]

The mission enemies had triumphed, but now they proceeded slowly to execute what they had for years determined to accomplish. Moreover they now encountered the resolute opposition of the missionary guardians. The friars would not battle for their own personal rights or privileges, but for the rights of their wards, the convert Indians; and though the conspirators triumphed in the end, for there was no court to appeal to, and with the irreligious cabal might was right, it was not until the missionaries had exposed to an amazed world the true sentiments and the flagrant injustice of the Echeandías, the Picos, the Vallejos, the Alvarados, etc., and had one by one dropped at their post among the helpless Indians for whom they had sacrificed their all; but we are anticipating.

In their Pronunciamento the revolters had declared that they would await the decision of the Supreme Government regarding the missions, and they promised "the missionary Fathers to observe respect, decorum, and the security of the property intrusted to their care." We shall presently learn what this declaration was worth. No sooner had Echeandía, December 9th, 1831, received the reins of government from Victoria, than he convoked the legislative assembly. The members Pio Pico, Mariano Vallejo, Antonio Ósio, and Santiago Argüello met at Los Angeles on January 10th, 1832, and were next day joined by José Joaquín Ortega and Tomás Yorba. J. B. Alvarado took part as secretary. The resignation of Victoria was approved, and Pio Pico, the senior member, according to the law of May 6th, 1822, was elected temporary gefe-politico or civil governor of California. The military command was left with Echeandía, who during the turmoil had remained at San Diego. This arrangement displeased the ex-governor. He claimed that the civil and military power of the governor could not be separated, and therefore refused to acknowledge the senior member of the assem-

[10] Bancroft, iii, 199; 204-210; Robinson, 129-131. Echeandía to Vallejo, December 9th, 1831. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. iii, 86-87; Echeandía to Pico, January 17th, 1832. Ibidem, 88-89.

bly as civil governor. For about twenty days the arch-plotter Pico was recognized by four or five members of the legislature, but after February 16th he laid no claims to the office and performed no official acts. Captain Agustín V. Zamorano of Monterey, as ranking officer, then pretended to represent the Supreme Government in California and so inaugurated another revolt. To avoid bloodshed Echeandía was allowed to rule from San Gabriel south,[11] and Zamorano was recognized in the north until the new governor to be appointed in Mexico should arrive.[12]

Before separating, the five members who constituted the notorious legislative assembly once more made a display of what really agitated their minds. At the last session, February 17th, 1832, Pio Pico, Vallejo, Joaquín Ortega, Antonio M. Ósio, and Santiago Argüello agreed upon the text of an address to the Supreme Government, and then went to sign it at San Diego on the 24th. "Such governors," they declare among other wild assertions,[13] "as have hitherto been sent to this country have been absolutely subject to the influence of the Spanish missionaries.[14] These missionaries, owing to pre-

---

[11] "Echeandía, retreating to San Juan Capistrano, gathered about him many Indians, whom his promises enticed from their work at the missions, and inaugurated a series of robberies and murders. Other Indians at distant points, especially in the south, revolted. The Indian was free, and he felt that his freedom entitled him to do any violence that might be convenient. Anarchy ruled throughout the province, and confusion covered the whole country." Tuthill, "California," 134.

[12] "Memorial," signed by Pio Pico, Mariano Vallejo, Antonio Ósio, and Joaquin Ortega, May 15th, 1832. "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 404-441; 469-476; 477-488. Hittell, ii, 148-150; Bancroft, iii, 216-232.

[13] Hittell's translation is here used for the reason that he is a partisan of the mission enemies. The extract is only a small portion of the original. Hittell probably thought it better for the reputation of his clients to suppress the other parts which read like the campaign speech of a ranting Socialist or crazy Anarchist.

[14] "Se ven absolutamente sujetos al influjo de los Padres Misioneros Españoles." Fancy Echeandía under the absolute influence of the friars! These young would-be statesmen were imbued with silly nativism, and therefore already hinted at the necessity of appointing a paisano, from their own gang, of course.

possessions in their favor and to general fanaticism,[15] have acquired and enjoy a certain amount of acceptance among the larger portion of the population. This they have managed greatly to augment by means of the wealth of the territory, which has been placed in their hands [16] and which they have administered to the prejudice of the wretched neophytes, who have been compelled to labor incessantly and without deriving any advantages whatever either to themselves or their children from their labor. Up to date, consequently, these unfortunates have remained in the same unhappy circumstances as at the beginning of the conquest, with the exception of a very few who have acquired some knowledge of their natural rights, but in general they have languished in oppression. They have been ground down by stripes, inflicted with the object of suppressing in their minds the inborn tendency to seek relief from tyranny in the liberty, which manifests itself in republican ideas. During the entire history of the country, the missionaries have never lost an opportunity of seducing the hearts of the governors and eradicating from their bosoms every sentiment of philanthropy in favor of the Indians. It is on this account that the governors have so frequently violated the laws and rendered themselves obnoxious to the people of intelligence, who have detested the sinister views which have thus been instilled into them by the enemies of the country, and which have been the origin and the cause of all

[15] Like parrots the Pico cabal merely repeat what it had imbibed from atheistic foreigners with whom fidelity to the Commandments of God is fanaticism. These overgrown boys, who had escaped the schoolmaster's rod too early, scarcely knew the force of the terms they used. Needless to say, they had never received a thorough Christian instruction, notwithstanding that Pico claimed he had learned the catechism from cover to cover. One is at a loss to see on what grounds they insisted on being regarded as Catholics.

[16] not by these paisanos, surely. The missionaries by their personal labors, abstemiousness, and economy had created the wealth of the missions with the assistance of the Indians. The latter alone would have produced nothing. The same friars, too, were making it possible for the military, including the traducers, to live at all. However, the arguments adduced refute themselves.

evils that have afflicted the territory. It is under such influences that Victoria shaped his course, every step being directed by the missionaries and other Spaniards,[17] who are disaffected to government, and whose very presence in the country is a violation of the laws. To them and their guidance he has ceded his conscience. He has treated the citizens with contempt, etc."[18]

In a memorial to the General Government the disgruntled Pico, Vallejo, Ósio, and Joaquín Ortega on May 15th, 1832, after another long diatribe, revert to the same subject as follows: "The chief causes of the grievous evils under which the country has suffered are: first, the presence in the territory of the Spanish missionaries;[19] secondly, the condition of slavish oppression in which the neophytes are held under the detestable mission system;[20] and thirdly, the union of the military and political commands in one and the same person. On account of this union the missionaries, who exercise great influence and power over the military chief, wield the same over the political chief and thus manage, despotic as they naturally

---

[17] Naturally. Because the governor would not be influenced by the turbulent paisanos, he must necessarily be led by the friars! Queer logic; but then the Pico crowd was declaiming for effect.

[18] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 477-488. No, good reader, in this and the next lengthy quotation you do not hear a ranting Socialist or a wild Anarchist, but only a number of unruly schoolboys practicing at bombast. It is reproduced to show the chief source of the calumnies heaped upon the devoted missionaries ever since.

[19] Most of the friars then living had toiled in the territory before any of the paisano memorialists were born. It certainly was not the merit of the Picos, Vallejos, etc., that their cradle stood in California, nor were they more respectable for it than their parents. Their charge was silly nativism. A little modesty would have been in order. What native or foreign birth, after all, had to do with effective preaching of the Gospel is a mystery. The Apostles were foreigners to nearly all the countries in which they announced the Glad Tidings. The Pico rabble was certainly not moved by the spirit of Christianity.

[20] Well, these unchristian nativists later inaugurated another system, and we shall have the painful task of describing the frightful consequences.

are, to keep down the Indian population by a joinder of authority and force. The missionaries are thus enabled with impunity and at their own arbitrary will to inflict punishments upon the neophytes and to scourge them publicly; nor has it ever been known that their so-called paternal feelings for their spiritual flock has ever shrunk from exercising this tyranny. They possess, though for what reason is not known, the power to act in this respect as they please; and they are countenanced in everything they do by orders of the military chief, under whose authority they carry out their determinations and even their whims. They accomplish their object with the aid of the corporal and four soldiers who are supported in the missions respectively and fulfill whatever the missionaries direct, etc."[21]

These statements are so much at variance with the facts, and so absurd on the face of them, that we wonder how men in their senses could pen them, and how a lawyer with any discrimination, as Hittell claims to be, could present this ludicrous, extravagant, and monstrous caricature as the true picture of the reality; but we have learned ere this that his history is absolutely worthless in nearly everything that pertains to the missionaries and their methods. Bancroft, on the other hand, though for the same reasons that moved Hittell, by no means a friend of Catholic missionaries, disdained to put faith in the sincerity of those early Californians. To the action of the said diputados as depicted in the preceding extracts from their Pronunciamento and memorial he makes the contemptuous note: "Truly Pico, Vallejo, and Ósio were becoming very radical republicans and ardent patriots according to the Mexican ideal. However, they were angry at the time, and were declaiming for effect in Mexico."[22] Nor did the Government pay any attention to the drivel of the young California would-be statesmen.

The self-characterization of all the Californians who became prominent in their war on the Indian missions and missionaries would not be complete did we not permit the loudest,

[21] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 469-476; Hittell, ii, 148-153.

[22] Bancroft, iii, 314.

most inflated, and most untruthful blusterer among them to unbosom himself. In this way we shall obtain a correct judgment of them "out of their own mouth."[23] Only one year after the preceding remarkable papers had been issued, February 24th, 1832, Mariano G. Vallejo addressed the senior member of the notorious legislative assembly as follows: "Most Excellent Sir,[24] an organic constitution for our territory would be the most advantageous means for its prosperity. The introduction of industrious people would increase the wealth of our lands. Enlightened teachers would lay the foundation for the benefit of the republican form of government, and by means of educating the youth they would make the brightest talents naturally found in the native children (*hijos del país*) shine forth, and thus industry would spread. Rulers of integrity would execute the wise laws that govern us, foster liberal arts, concern themselves about the public welfare, and seek the happiness of all.

"For many years the country has suffered for being enveloped in doubts and disputes which have benumbed the most precious strides for its enlightenment. Entirely demoralized and swamped by the ancient maxims and customs of our oppressors, even now there is observed in the inhabitants generally a disinclination for our republican ideas, and there is noticed an utter contempt for our institutions,[25] so that the people are inclined at every step to act under the influence of

---

[23] "Ex ore tuo judico te, serve nequam." Luk. xix, 22.

[24] The young upstarts felt big and important, hence the extravagance in applying titles. Vallejo himself later on loved to parade as "general," though he never had a command of more than three hundred men.

[25] "Se ve en los habitantes en general un desafecto á las ideas republicanas; se advierte un completo desprecio á nuestras instituciones." The people could hardly be blamed, for the dish of republicanism served by the Pico crowd could not but produce nausea with those who think. Vallejo's admission is most valuable, in that it correctly pictures the state of mind of the inhabitants as a whole. They would have nothing to do with that kind of republicanism. Surely then the missionaries could not be expected to approve it.

the considerable number of Spaniards, public enemies of our system, who abound in this territory.[26] Favoring ignorance in the citizens, they toil incessantly to stupefy them, and cooperate in the destruction of the sciences and of the enlightenment which is the fundamental, advantageous basis of countries for the preservation of society and the source of the wealth of nations.

"The governors, who down to this date have come to this territory, are seen to be absolutely subject to the influence of the Spanish Missionary Fathers,[27] who unfortunately enjoy a certain popularity among the greater part of the inhabitants through the prejudices and the fanaticism [28] which they considerably augment by means of the wealth of the land which is in their hands, and of which they dispose as they please to the prejudice of the unhappy neophytes, who labor incessantly and neither they themselves nor their children enjoy anything of it,[29] inasmuch as to date they are in the same circumstances of stupidity in which they were at the beginning of the conquest,[30] with the exception of some portion of them who, though they well understand their natural rights, are

[26] Later Vallejo and his kind insisted on being regarded as Spaniards, and they looked with disdain on Mexicans, even though they were natives of California.

[27] The preceding chapters show how ridiculous was this charge.

[28] That is, Religion, of course. Yes, good reader, Vallejo's name, like those of his fellow conspirators, appears in the baptismal register; but like them he had "emancipated" himself from the obligations contracted in Baptism, and, as he boasts, from every influence of God's accredited ministers. Instead he had blindly surrendered himself to the guidance of so-called "Freethinkers" who do not think, and will not let others use the mental faculties according to the rules of sound reason. That must be borne in mind, otherwise the antics of these early paisano chiefs will remain inexplicable puzzles.

[29] This nonsense is refuted by every reputable historian. However, in the next volume we shall see how the Indians fared in the service of this same "Don Mariano."

[30] Well, were the raving conspirators capable of improving the condition of the Indians? When they took charge, the result was just what could be foreseen: Degradation or annihilation.

destroyed and flogged to make them abandon those happy ideas with which their natural talents invest them to seek liberty independent of tyranny and oppression thereby manifesting their republican ideas.

"The aforesaid missionaries overlook no opportunity to win over the hearts of those in power in order to lead them away from the sentiments of philanthropy with which their patriotic love ought to be adorned. Thus it happens that they (the governors) frequently break the laws and consequently become odious to the citizens of enlightenment [31] who avoid their sinister purposes which result from the seduction of our enemies. These evils in our opinion are the causes of the calamities in Upper California.

"It was these principles that actuated Comandante-General and Governor Don Manuel Victoria, who made all his steps under the direction of the Missionary Fathers and other Spaniards, who in virtue of the laws and on account of their disaffection with our system should not remain in our [32] territory. He exercised his affection absolutely for their protection, despised the citizens and administered justice according to his caprice which inclined more to the preservation of his friendships. He absolutely benumbed the liberty of speaking and writing as though he were empowered to trample upon the laws that protect it. He frequently spoke of the ample powers which he possessed, but never exhibited them. Finally, owing to his disregard, he became a tyrant in the sight of enlightened men,[33] and made room for the calamities which our territory suffers.

"Your Excellency [34] may make of this our representation

---

[31] Such as this inflated Vallejo blusterer.

[32] "Our" territory, indeed! Vallejo was well termed the "Windbag."

[33] "hombres de ilustracion!" Of course, Vallejo means his pompous self and confederates. He was then an experienced youth of twenty-four; Alvarado counted one winter less.

[34] Pico was the senior deputy. The title was not even due to the governors whom the Fathers generally addressed as "Su Señoría."—Your Honor.

the use which is most convenient,[35] for our only purpose is to manifest to the Supreme Government that our actions were executed in order that evils might be averted, and at the peril of being ill-treated we did for public order what was in our power by bringing ourselves within the tenor of the existing laws. We should have continued our sessions in working out measures useful for our territory, but the impediment that arose prohibited our beneficent intentions." [36]

The Bustamante administration, to which belonged Lúcas Alamán as Minister of Foreign and Internal Relations, looked with a certain degree of favor upon the missions, but on account of troubles of its own it could not think of avenging Victoria, much less do anything for the neophytes for fear of arousing more widespread dissatisfaction. Victoria's treatment, and above all the loud clamors of the *paisano* faction, which had culminated in Echeandía's audacious decree and proclamation against the missions, may have led the Supreme Government to imagine that the demand for a change in the management of the Indians was general. Doubtless, if Bustamante had remained in power, amicable arrangements would have been effected which would have satisfied every reasonable demand for land that the missions might have been in position to spare. The missionaries would have cooperated on the basis of justice which compensated the rightful owners, the Indians, as was and is the custom in the United States. Unfortunately, the arch-plotter Santa Ana could not rest, and thus with the downfall of the conservative government in August 1832, and the accession to power of the radical element, it was highly probable that the noisy and unscrupulous California schemers would be heeded and the missions become their booty.

At all events, early in 1831 the Bustamante Government

---

[35] It was filed away with other papers; that was about all done with the silly effusion of a bombast.

[36] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. i, 485-487. Vallejo uses expressions found with Echeandía. Either Vallejo learned the lessons of demagogy from the ex-governor, which is probable, or both had the same prompter, Padrés for instance.

requested Fr. Durán to ascertain the views of the missionaries on a change in the missionary conditions of California. The Fr. Presidente accordingly issued a circular on August 13th. In this document he invited the Fathers to express their opinions on a plan which provided for the "emancipation" of the neophytes and the distribution of the mission estates on a basis which insured the continuance of Divine Worship at each establishment, the support of the missionaries, and the permanence of a certain amount of community property with which to found new missions in the north and east.[37] This arrangement, though it would have received the approval of the Fathers if the Indians could manage their property, would not have satisfied the Picos, Vallejos, and others who wanted control of both the property and the Indians. The missions would have been of no value to the enemies unless there were hands to work the fields and care for the stock; for they themselves disdained to labor. Moreover, they wanted positions which provided a salary. It is for these reasons that the enemies of the friars demanded the removal of the unsalaried missionaries.

The replies of only three friars are extant, but they disclose the sentiments of all the missionaries, and of themselves will serve to refute the charges and insinuations of mercenariness and selfishness launched against them by the early Californians. "The time has come," Fr. Juan Cabot writes from Mission San Fernando, "which is so much desired for throwing from my weak shoulders such a heavy burden;[38] but the more I study and discuss the subject, the more nothing but difficulties present themselves which I dare not even face lest I precipitate myself into them. Therefore, in order to escape the ruin my pen might produce, I keep silent. I will only say to Your Reverence that I think it will be difficult for the neophytes to manage their

[37] Fr. Durán, "Circular," as per letter of Fr. Juan Cabot. See note 39.

[38] That is to say, the administration of the mission property and control of the Indians.

own interests. I am rather of the opinion that they will be very prodigal with their property when they are given the control thereof. Furthermore I will say that, on account of the nature of the soil and the scarcity of water, they will have to retire at least six leagues away from the mission if they are to raise crops, as is done now while they live together in community. My fifty-one years together with my ailments oblige me to protest that I shall not be able to answer to God and the nation for the moral instruction and the administration of the Sacraments to the Indians when they are so far away. I shall therefore consider myself excused. Concerning the third point, as to what may be set apart for the maintenance of Divine Worship, I am under the impression that nothing will be left to my care. I shall be content with what the charity of the nation and of the Indians may allow me for my support." [39]

Fr. José Joaquín Jimeno of Santa Cruz had this to say: "With regard to the change in the mission system which the Supreme Government proposes, I observe many and immense difficulties on all sides. In order to satisfy the wishes of the Government and of Your Reverence that we give our opinion and desires in this particular, I will say that, in consideration of the very weighty reasons set forth by the Government that the Indians ought not to continue subject to the mission Fathers, but that they should be set free, and knowing at the same time that we can no longer bear the burden overwhelmed as we are with this painful task, which every day grows more insupportable, I am of the opinion that the temporalities should be distributed to their *legitimate owners, the Indians,* and that the neophytes should be given their liberty, but that they should be obliged to work and to preserve their allotment by preventing them from becoming vagrants running up and down as they desire,

[39] "Solo estaré contento con lo que me dé la caridad de la Nacion, ó la de los Indios para mi manutencion." Fr. Cabot to Fr. Durán, August 24th, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

because they are very inconstant and fickle. Above all, the three reservations should be made." [40]

Fr. Ex-Presidente José Sánchez of San Gabriel Mission wrote: "Though I have not sufficient knowledge to offer a comprehensive opinion on the subject, I will explain in a few words what I think. Of course I submit to everything the Supreme Government disposes. If Your Reverence wants to be the chief cause of the destruction of the missions which have cost our predecessors and us so much labor, there is nothing left but to accede to what is proposed. Indeed, Father, the first who in the public papers broached the ruin of the territory, or let us say of the missions, are the very ones who so much desire to have the said project executed. Let us cast a glance at the missions of the Jesuit Fathers in Pimeria Alta and Baja [41] and those of Lower California.[42] The success which our government met there will be an object lesson. In view of all this I will say without passion that Divine Worship, the support of the missionaries, and permanency of a small fund for new missions will in a few days be in the same condition as remained the missions I just mentioned.

"I protest that this little to which I have given expression is what my conscience dictates to me for the benefit of the neophytes, and more so for the tranquillity of the territory. For a long time I have been hearing of this plan. As far as I am concerned, for my peace of mind, would to God that it would be to-morrow, so that I might retire within the four walls of a cell and bewail the time which I have wasted for the welfare of these unfortunates." [43]

---

[40] Maintenance of Divine Worship, support of the missionaries, and funds for founding new missions. Fr. Jimeno to Fr. Durán, October 2nd, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[41] Lower Arizona and Upper Sonora. See "The Franciscans in Arizona."

[42] See vol. i, this work, parts ii and iii.

[43] "Digo por que á mi toca, que para mi sosiego, Ojalá! sea el dia de mañana, para recogerme entre las cuatro paredes de una

The opinion of Fr. Vicente de Sarriá, till then comisario-prefecto of the Franciscans in California, and probably the most esteemed of the missionaries, may be added here. It was expressed in the previous year when he gently urged Echeandía to make haste slowly in this matter. "Cast a glance over the history not only of America but of Europe," he wrote to the governor, "in order to see that the tribes emerged from the darkness of barbarism, and the rays of the dawn of civilization appeared, gradually by the aid of the Gospel. . . . I have heard that pueblos are to be formed of the missions. Well, in all this I have nothing else to do but to show the most submissive and respectful obedience as I do and always shall do scrupulously." [44] Yet it was this very Fr. Sarriá whom Echeandía had put under arrest and planned to expel from the territory for disloyalty! Like all the Fathers, Fr. Sarriá was thoroughly discouraged. No redress could be expected, and physical resistance was out of the question. With bleeding hearts they foresaw the temporal and worse spiritual ruin, but submitted to the inevitable after they had exhausted every argument of reason and Religion with men who listened to neither.

Let the reader compare these letters with the hue and cry of Vallejo, Pico and fellow conspirators quoted in this chapter, and then let him judge which manifest sincere love for the Indians and California. Every one of the mission Fathers sighed to be relieved of the administration of the property created by means of hard labor on the part of the friars and neophytes; but they wanted the real owners to enjoy what was theirs, and not the covetous, indolent, and unscrupulous white chiefs to control it. For thus standing between the helpless Indians and rapacious conspirators, the missionaries were reviled in the most outrageous manner. They only objected to confiscation, not to secularization, as

celda á llorar el tiempo que tengo desperdiciado á beneficio de estos miserables." Fr. Sánchez to Fr. Durán, September 7th, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[44] Fr. Sarriá to Echeandía, October 1st, 1830. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2077.

is evident from everything they wrote on the subject. On the other hand, the turbulent leaders cared nothing for the welfare of the Indians, otherwise they would have applauded the efforts of the missionaries instead of hampering them in every way possible. From selfish motives they wanted to take the places of the friars, and this they finally accomplished to the degradation and ruin of the neophytes and the destruction of the once flourishing establishments, as we shall see in the course of the narrative.

When Fr. Durán had ascertained the sentiments of the missionaries on the subject, he prepared a long and exhaustive exposition of the whole case in the shape of commentaries on Echeandía's decree of January 6th. It doubtless caused the Government to hesitate committing itself to any scheme that even remotely seemed to favor the enemies of the missions. Bancroft says of this paper, "It was one of the ablest documents that was ever written by a friar in California. On the decree, article by article, Padre Narciso expends the full force of his talent and learning, with not infrequent volleys of wit, sarcasm, ridicule, and bitter denunciation. Not a weak spot, and there were many, is overlooked, and not a weapon is neglected." [45] The sincere friend of truth will therefore be gratified if we reproduce the precious document entire in the next chapter.

[45] Bancroft, iii, 309.

CHAPTER V.

Fr. Durán's Magnificent Exposure of the Confiscation Scheme.—Neophytes in the Position of Children Under Age.—Echeandía Misconstrues Law of September 13th, 1813.—Failure of Emancipation.—Neophytes Not Forced into Subjection; Not Discontented.—Missionaries Loyal.—Law of September 1813 Abused.—Indians Not Freed.—Unjust Distribution of Lands in Spite of Law of January 4th, 1813.—Neophytes Robbed.—At the Mercy of Speculators.

ECHEANDÍA'S Decree of Mission Confiscation, as we have seen in its place,[1] was illegally issued on January 6th, 1831, and signed by both the author and J. M. Padrés. It contains thirty-three Articles with a preamble of four Whereases. The synopsis of each is here followed by the respective "Nota" of Fr. Presidente Durán.

1. "Whereas all men, except the mission Indians, are free and enjoy civil liberty with the right to do anything not opposed to the established laws, etc."

Note 1. "The children of the family, are they free or not? If they are, then are also the converts at the missions free, because they owe nothing more than filial and domestic subjection to the missionary. If the children of the family are not free, how then is it said in this article that only the Indians of the missions are not free among the rest of human society? The truth is, subjection of the pupil to his teacher, and more so that of the minor to his guardian, is not opposed to natural or civil liberty rightly understood, as it agrees well with the (idea of) master of all the things that belong to him through inheritance and other legitimate titles. St. Paul himself tells us that the heir while he is a child *sub tutoribus et actoribus est cum sit dominus om-*

[1] See chapter iii, this section. Echeandía, "Secularization Decree," January 6th, 1831. "Cal. Arch.," Mis. and Colon., ii, 120-128.

nium.[2] Thus the neophytes are the masters and heirs of their property; but they are children and minors, and consequently they need some one to direct and defend them, and for this they must necessarily be in subjection, which by far does not reach that of the children of the family; for beyond the hours of community work, which are well moderated, they dispose of their time and personal liberty as they please. If nevertheless pretexts are sought for greater liberty to the neophytes, why are they not at once emancipated and transferred from the charge of the missionaries to the control of the town councils, administrators, etc.?"

2. "Whereas the law of September 13th, 1813, expressly provides that the missions should be formed into towns."

Note 2. "The law of which this Whereas speaks in the first article directs the surrender of the spiritual administration to the bishops. Why does not the Echeandía Proclamation start where the law begins? The Proclamation only speaks of the temporal administration, whereas the law touches this point in the sixth and last article, where it says with much clearness and distinctness that the estates or temporal property of the neophytes should be managed, not by white administrators as the Proclamation has it, but by the neophytes themselves, by those namely who should have more ability for managing. Consult the aforesaid law of September 13th, Article 6, and mark the wrong that is done to the neophytes by taking the management of their property from them and passing it to the control of strangers."

3. "Whereas to continue the granting of licenses to neophytes for establishing themselves away from the missions will result in great evils."

Note 3. "Why then have such licenses been given in the terms in which they were granted? Echeandía himself here acknowledges that *this resulted in grave evils to the emancipated and to the towns.* It was not owing to the motives expressed in the text, but plainly because the most insubor-

[2] Gal. iv, 1-2, "is under tutors and governors though he be lord of all."

dinate and vicious were emancipated. The result therefore could be none other than that confessed by the author himself. This was the consequence of acting *motu proprio,* and without consulting those who had more experience."

4. "Whereas the legislative assembly is convinced that the neophytes, because under forcible restraint, are discontented, that most of the missionaries have declared themselves disaffected with independence and the system of government, and that the decay of the missions must follow, it resolved, August 1830, in accord with my propositions the manner of distributing the lands and property. I have therefore determined to decree for the present."

Note 4. "Here many false impressions will be produced in one who is far away from the missions. There is no such force, if physical force is meant, employed to bring Indians into subjection to the missions. Only moral inducements are held out. These consist in the respect which the pagans have for the missionary after they have been befriended and visited by him in their rancherias. This regard, however, only inclines them to come to the missions, not to be baptized, but to become better acquainted so that in time with good treatment and patience they voluntarily express the wish to be baptized, as is generally the case. If some do not want to accept Baptism (they are few), they either depart on their own account or they are sent away without being molested.

"The general discontent, which this Whereas states as a fact, is greatly exaggerated and contradicts the third Whereas; for there it is said *that not all leave the missions who might do so.* Why then do they not leave or have they not left, *if the discontent is general?* There is then no such general discontent if only a few gave up their neophyteship when many could have done so if they had wished. Supposing that this charge of general discontent were not exaggerated, what do the authors of the Proclamation want to infer? Are they, forsooth, not aware that the neophytes remain children throughout their lives? Are they ignorant of

the fact that school children grumble because they must go to school?

"Although the majority of the missionaries, as is well known to the Supreme Government, have refused to take the oath on the Mexican Constitution for reasons of conscience, which must always be heeded, we have nevertheless promised fidelity and submission and we have observed both with honor. The governor would be glad if those who have taken the oath had acted in like manner. Under these circumstances the Supreme Government itself has tolerated us and recognized our ministry. As it is a matter which has gone to a higher tribunal, His Honor Echeandía is a very incompetent judge. Some years have gone by since, and I do not see that the missions have decayed. On the contrary, notwithstanding that these missions are situated in the farthest corner of the civilized world, they have attracted the commerce of some thousands of leagues distant. It will not be surprising if in the future decay should set in; for the neophytes have been insubordinate since the year 1825.[8] I could here go into particulars, in order to contradict the supposed decline of the missions, on the subject of agriculture, mechanical arts, and industry of poor neophytes who but yesterday were savages, and compare them with the Indians serving at the four presidios, three pueblos, and numberless ranches of the whites, who after so many years have learned nothing beyond caring for cattle and horses, and who know no other art than that of the cowboy."

Article 1. "San Gabriel and San Carlos should be organized as towns, but the latter should retain its name Carmelo."

Note 5. "In this article the titular name of Mission San Carlos is changed. After all, the improvement is small, if the political change is considered; but it would be another thing if it is intended to include the ecclesiastical or canonical title. As it is, at the very beginning of the article it is

[8] from the time Echeandía appeared in the territory. He was the real cause of Indian insubordination.

necessary to advert to the incompetence of the authors, whether it is His Honor Echeandía or the Most Excellent Deputation; for the system of the missions has been the work of the former Supreme Government in accord with the College of San Fernando. To alter it the authority of the present Supreme Government is necessary and it must be communicated to us by the same College. One cannot understand how subordinate authorities without being expressly authorized (and this is not mentioned), can meddle with such an ordinance of the supreme authority. Now that the missions of San Gabriel and San Carlos are turned into towns through this article, why are they not granted their own independent town councils like any other town?"

Art. 2. "At San Gabriel four police commissaries shall be elected. They shall be dependent in everything upon the town council of Los Angeles."

Note 6. "Here we see Mission San Gabriel already subjected to the town council of the neighboring white settlement. This means that neophytes, who but yesterday gave up paganism, are drawn away from the paternal and domestic charge of the missionary and surrendered to the hands of those whom they hardly know, and of whom one does not know what interest they can take in the true and personal welfare of the neophytes. Now that the missions of San Gabriel and San Carlos are considered to be changed into pueblos, why do they not begin to give them their own town council, instead of subjecting them to one that is strange to them? This is contrary to the aforesaid law of September 13th, 1813, which says that the Indians must have their *own ayuntamientos,* and through these everything must be disposed relative to the administration of their property. Though the intervention of the governor is required, it is one thing to intervene and another (thing) to dispose like a master. The intervention which this law concedes to said authority is merely that he should see that persons *from among the same Indians,* and no others, are named to manage the estates. It does not allow this official to decree

that other administrators from a race not Indian should be appointed. Inasmuch as it is pretended to give the Indians greater liberty, the question arises: What liberty do the Indians gain by being passed from one hand to another? Here it may also be said that an evil already known is of more use than a good that is still to be learned. If they had begun with the emancipation of the Indians, and with the allotting of the estates and property to the neophytes, at some of the older missions whose neophytes were all born there, then I should believe that they were looking for the greater welfare of the Indians. What need, anyway, has His Honor Echeandía of more exact information about the Mission San Gabriel population when every year an official report of the same has been sent to him?"

Art. 4. "The ranches belonging to the said missions shall have a sub-commissary if the number of inhabitants be considerable."

Note 7. "The ranches which the missions possess generally are large centers, especially for cattle and sheep. Now we see that they are to be under a sub-commissary; he is subject to the police commissaries of the mission, and they again are to be under the town council of the whites who look upon the Indian's intellect as inferior to theirs. It seems they are tending to this: the estates which are the sole property of Indians shall pass over to the control of the people called and recognized here as the people of reason. Why this, inasmuch as it is contrary to the law of September 13th, 1813?

Art. 5. "Farming and grazing lands, which by constant use down to the date of swearing to the independence, or by approval of the territorial government, they have cultivated and occupied, are to remain the property of the pueblos, which will be composed of their neophytes and of such other Mexicans as may wish to settle in them."

Note 8. "In this article the right of ownership of the Indians over their lands is ignored, and no other right is recognized than that which is based on 'the constant use' or on 'the approbation' of the territorial government, where-

FR. ANTONIO PEIRI, O. F. M.

as it is certain and manifest that before all use and all government approbation the Indians were already the lords and absolute masters of California. This article wants these lands to be the property of the Indians and of whomsoever of another race that settles in their neighborhood. It would be well, even for other reasons, first to consider what advantage the unhappy Indians derive from association with other races; for if now, when they have some one to defend them and advocate their cause, they suffer so many vexations, contempt, and insults from the other race, how will it be when they will be left without protection in the hands of those to whom they are surrendered by the Proclamation?"

Art. 6. "To neophytes, including those absent with leave, and to other servants of the missions wishing to remain, will be distributed, to each family a house-lot seventy-five varas square and a field two hundred varas square, the lots in blocks of four, one hundred and fifty varas square with suitable streets and plazas."

Note 9. "This article gives equal rights to acquire lots and fields to the neophytes, who are the owners, and to the servants of the missions, who are white people working for wages and salaries and having no ownership of anything. That is to say, the servants are given equal rights to the property with their masters. This, indeed is a strange law, through which the servant obtains as much right as the master in the latter's own home, and with the danger of making the master still less, considering the character of both classes; for it is much to be feared that in a short time the former servants will absorb the whole substance of the masters, and the masters will become servants." [4]

Art. 7. "All inhabitants of the two missions more than twenty-five years old, or eighteen if married, are entitled

[4] What Fr. Durán feared actually came to pass: the Indians were driven from their property, the mission land, and were glad to sustain life by laboring for these former mission servants, the administrators.

to full ownership of lands, but such lands must not be subjected to any encumbrances nor ever pass to mortmain."

Note 10. "In Article 5 it has been said that the pueblos of San Gabriel and of Carmelo shall be composed not only of the neophytes actually living there, *but also of all of the other classes who may join them;* and all are equal at the distribution of the lots and fields according to Art. 6, that is to say, of all the land belonging to said pueblos. Now Art. 7 is no more satisfied with this provision, but includes all new-comers who have become inhabitants of these pueblos, and they are to have equal rights in the property at the distribution of the lands of the natives, who hold them by the law of nature, by possession, and by use. Why do the framers of the decree not speak of deserted and abandoned lands, but only of *cultivated and irrigated lands which the Indians by constant usage or with the approbation of the territorial government have cultivated and occupied with their property?"* Is this just? Can a lower authority thus dispose of what has been recognized by nature, or let us say by usage, if you will, as the property of others? I should like to know whether the framers of the decree would do likewise with the boundless lands possessed by white ranchers?[5] It is very certain that they would not, because the ranchers would know how to defend them. Well, is it not taking advantage of the helpless and defenceless condition of the neophytes to rob them of their lands and give them to their rivals? The Government of the United States in the north, in order to obtain possession of the Indian land, purchases it from them, as we know; but here, taking a more direct road, not the Supreme Government, however, but a much inferior govern-

[5] In spite of the loud charges of the mission enemies that the missions occupied all land from one mission to another, there were many large ranchos, as we shall see later. Besides there were many uncultivated stretches which might have been taken up; but the covetous whites would not go through the trouble of reclaiming them as the friars had done with the aid of the neophytes. They wanted the already cultivated neophyte land. See Appendix G.

ment, does not trouble about purchasing and selling. With a stroke of the pen everything is neatly settled. Here it is necessary to repeat what has been said in another note on the incompetence of the authority of the originators of the Proclamation in the present case, especially as in the aforesaid law of January 4th, 1813, it is ordered that only the unclaimed and unappropriated land should be apportioned. Such cannot be said of those lands possessed by the neophytes through constant use and occupation of their property. Hence it seems to be against the tenor of this law and the sacred right of ownership to make this land the common property of the neophytes and of the other classes on the mere title of residence among the neophytes, since it is certain that this gives no ownership by any law."

Art. 8. "Within six months after the publication of the change of a mission into a pueblo each family shall receive three cows, two horses, two sheep, one yoke of oxen, a mule or an ass; the various implements enumerated, and they are also to receive one year's rations proportioned to the preceding crop."

Note 11. "So then three cows and only two sheep are to be allotted to each family of neophytes? and the thousands which San Gabriel, for instance, possesses, what are they wanted for? With regard to the distribution of mules and asses and the rest of which this article makes mention San Carlos may be excused, for as can be seen from the annual reports it has almost nothing of the kind;[6] and as far as the distribution of the fields is concerned, it may also be left out of the count, because where there is nothing or almost nothing, nothing can be distributed. What care will the Indians bestow upon the implements? It is easy to foretell without being a prophet, if only you consider their character. With-

[6] Incessant forced contributions had already squeezed the life out of Fr. Serra's most beloved mission. After 1833 the missionary found it impossible to exist, and therefore took up his quarters at Monterey. Some other missions were in a similar plight, as we shall see in the local annals.

out work they have acorns and seeds, which nature affords them and which they relish more than our seeds. From this it can be inferred with certainty what care they will bestow on the implements; it is best not to make the trial."

Art. 11. "Unmarried neophytes of twenty-five years and more shall have only one-half of the lot and of the field granted in Art. 6; and they shall also have a smaller share in the live-stock, implements, etc."

Note 12. "In this article to the neophytes of more than twenty-five years of age are conceded one-half of a lot and of a field which to outsiders, such as the white servants, are granted entire, with the additional right of increasing them if the land allows it, whereas this right is denied the aforesaid neophytes. Who can find out the just or legal principle upon which such a strange division of land is based? land to which no one has a right except the neophytes? Shall the unmarried neophyte receive only one-half of what belongs to him, of what he has cultivated or acquired, whilst the stranger obtains an entire portion even with the right to increase it? What if the single man marries after some time and has a numerous family? Shall he be bound to live in straitened circumstances whilst he sees strangers enjoying themselves with what was his own? Verily, a full share indeed! Yet this is not the worst. It seems no attention is paid to the distribution of lands for the married neophytes under eighteen years, or for the single neophytes under twenty-five years. How are these to support themselves? Does not everything belong to the neophytes under that age as well as to those who are respectively eighteen and twenty-five years old? Have they not labored for it? Have they not sweated for it? Why are they not called in to have a share in the division? What fault of theirs is it that they should be excluded from what belonged to their fathers and ancestors, and that strangers should take it? Will it, forsooth, be said that they are included in the shares which their parents receive? but then it is something common to be orphaned before one is of age. Then, what of the women

under age and those not married? Why is there no mention made of them? Why are they not considered when strangers are provided for? Verily, I do not comprehend how Señor Echeandía could make such arrangements. I can say with certainty that he would not have decreed the division of the lands of the white people in the manner in which he made decrees regarding the land of the Indians. This much is certain: there will be no one who will not compassionate the unhappiness of the poor Indians." [7]

Art. 12. "To other families that wish to settle in the new pueblos shall be given lots and fields in proportion."

Note 13. "Herein is confirmed what has been said in the preceding note, that is to say, any immigrant has as much right to the lots and fields of the Indians as the neophytes themselves and even more; for on the Indians the condition is placed that they must be over eighteen years, even if they are married, but not on the white new-comers. It is not even asked whether the latter are married. Consequently here legal equality disappears, even suppose it were granted that all have a right to a share in the division of the Indian lands."

Art. 13. "All property thus distributed shall be indivisible and inalienable for five years."

Note 14. "This article opens the door so that after five years the neophytes will be without property or lands, if you take into consideration the dullness of the Indians and the shrewdness of the people called *de razon.* See Note 9 on Art. 6. It seems that the object of this article and of some others is to amalgamate and to fuse the two rival classes, that is to say, the Indian with the white race by means of legal reunion and equality. I see, however, that nature does not obey men. On the contrary they must obey nature."

Art. 14. "The names of the white individuals and the allotment made to each family of these new pueblos shall be

[7] except, of course, the covetous Californians so called. "Es bien seguro: Quien no se compadecerá de la infelicidad de los pobres Indios?"

recorded as well as the lands and property reserved for the general good."

Note 15. "This article orders the enrollment of all the inhabitants of the new pueblos, as well as the noting of all the property assigned to each family; but as these families and outsiders necessarily consist not only of neophytes, but of all the Mexicans who wish to settle in said pueblos, according to Articles 5 and 12, it seems to be assumed as certain that those outsiders will share not only in the distribution of the lots and fields and lands occupied through constant use by the property of the Indians, but also that such outsiders will share in that very property which can be nothing else than the movable goods. If such is not the case, why is it commanded that all the goods allotted to each family shall be listed? What property can it be after the distribution of the lots and fields and lands has been made by the preceding articles if not the movable goods that are left? Is this just? What the Indians alone have labored for, acquired and toiled for? Is it just that the outsiders, who have contributed nothing to the labor or its product should nevertheless be given a share of it on the ground that they live there? Is there any law which lets an outsider make himself master of another's property on the ground of having settled in the neighborhood? Would such a decision be made if such property belonged to the whites, who are able to defend it, as it is done in the case of poor defenceless neophytes, whose weakness, it seems, is nothing but an incentive for another class to give free reins to oppression?"

Art. 17. "The remaining live-stock, etc., after the distribution, shall be put in pastures to the extent of four square leagues for each 1000 head of cattle, and three square leagues for small stock."

Note 16. "As to the remaining live-stock, after the slender distribution of three cows and two sheep, about which the article speaks, it will be discovered gradually what will be done with them. For the present I shall not say it; I wish the readers to divine what I mean."

CHAPTER VI.

Fr. Duran's Notes Continued.

Disregard for the Law of 1813.—Indians Overtaxed.—Salaried Officials to Replace Unsalaried Missionaries.—Indians Burdened to Ease White People.—Indians the Packmules and Scapegoats.—Talk of Schools Mere Claptrap.—Epilogue.—Real Aims of the Mission Enemies.—Victoria Defender of Indian Rights and Property.

ART. 18. "An administrator is to be appointed for each town; and for this purpose heads of families are to choose three men to be proposed to the town council (of whites), which body will forward the names to the governor with a report on their qualifications."

Note 17. "It has already been said in Note 2 to 'Whereas 2' that what the law of September 13th, 1813, commands is very different from what this article and the entire Proclamation enjoins. The principal point in said law is that the Indians themselves through their own councils must appoint, not whomsoever they please, but from among themselves, those who are satisfactory to them. This Proclamation disposes otherwise. It orders first that the choice shall be made not by the councils of the Indians, nor from among them, but from among the white settlers, to whom the neophytes are put into entire subjection beginning with the first articles in the chain; secondly, though the aforesaid law says nothing as to whether the administrators shall be able to write, the Proclamation makes this very condition in order to exclude the Indians from the administration of their own property, for the author knows that this suffices to take away the management from the Indians; lastly, the law commands that when the missionaries cease to manage the property, it must not pass into the control of strangers, but the Indians themselves shall control it, by appointing through their own councils and with the intervention of the governor the person, not

an outsider, but one of their own number, an *Indian,* an *Indian,* who shall have charge. The Proclamation, however, makes no mention whatever that the Indians shall have their own councils. Instead they are made subject to those whom they do not know. A condition is made which the law does not impose, that is to say, the Indians must know how to write, in order to curtail the liberty which the law leaves them. They are plainly told that they themselves cannot be administrators of what belongs to them, so that there is a certain kind of necessity of appointing some of the white people, who desire to benefit themselves. Among these there are more than enough aspirants for such a morsel without a bone, for such it appears to them, which will fatten them in a few days; but after two or three years, what then? We have before our eyes what happened in Sonora, where in two years the honorable white administrators brought the missions to such a state of ruin that in this year 1831, when the missionaries were again given charge of the Indian temporalities, they were compelled to go begging for cattle, horses and even kitchen utensils. This is known and notorious throughout this California. The worst of it is that the Christian communities are scattered forever." [1]

Art. 19. "The administrator shall have charge of all the remaining cattle, of the buildings, mills, vineyards, lands, gardens, implements, and everything else which he shall receive by inventory. Tithes will be collected."

Note 18. "Here again it is presupposed that the movable property as well as live-stock must be distributed among the new-comers or immigrants, since it presumes that the distribution has been made among the neighbors. As by neighbors are understood every Mexican settler in these new pueblos, it seems that we can infer that every Mexican has a right to the division that is presupposed to have been made before surrendering the remaining stock to the administrator.

[1] Fr. Durán is describing what actually befell the missions whose wanton confiscation and ruin he is resisting. See pp. 95-97 for the law of September 13th, 1813.

See Note 15 to Article 14. In this same article also the burden of tithes is imposed on the fields and stock of the Indians; on the other hand in Article 23 their property is again taxed for the decent support of the ministers of the Church; that means that they must twice pay tithes or twice pay for the support of the priests, whereas everywhere else they have always proceeded with the greatest caution in this tithing of Indians, as Solórzano has it in his *Politica Indiana,* Lib. 2, cap. 23. This was observed even among Indians who in their pagan state had some kind of public order and some form of government. Yet these poor Californian Indians, who in their savage state had no trace of public order or any form of government, and who have no century of reduction back of them like those of whom said Solórzano speaks, but who have just been reduced, are they bound to pay double tithes? What a shame! What injustice!

Art. 20. "The citizens interested (white council) will appoint the necessary mayordomos who shall look after the remaining live-stock and other property."

Note 19. "With all the administrators, mayordomos, commissaries, sub-commissaries, and I know not what more, it is easy to foretell where the substance of the missions will go. There is no need of reminding of what has just happened in Sonora and has happened before in other places."

Art. 21. "They will also propose to the commissary what salaries the administrators and mayordomos shall enjoy."

Note 20. "Stop! The missionaries have always managed things without salary; nay they have always added their own, that is to say, the sínodos or annual allowances and even the alms received for holy Masses, to the Indian mission funds, as is clear from the account books of all the missions. The former Memorias or goods were procured with said sínodos. If it had not been for these the missions would never have lifted their heads. What need was there of putting a new load of salary for administrators on the property of the Indians, when till now this property has been man-

aged without this additional tax? Is not this fattening on the goods of the poor?"

Art. 22. "From the remainder of the capital, rent of surplus lands, the yield of vineyards, etc., will be paid the wages of the schoolmaster, hospital expenses, and of other institutions of asylum, correction and instruction."

Note 21. "All the revenues will go for the most part to make up the administrator's salary during the short time while the capital lasts; but the rest of wages and expenses for servants, schools, hospitals, etc., is nothing but prattle full of folly to us who are eye-witnesses and understand the secret and the register of the organ, though it is well concocted to deceive those who are far away. Here the saying of the fox fits in quite well. When cornered by the hounds, and stumbling over a guitar, he exclaimed, 'The fox is good for a feast.' Excellent are the conditions at the missions for such expenses, especially at that of San Carlos, where at times the Missionary Father has not had any bread to eat." [2]

Art. 23. "The missionary will be allowed $1000 salary at San Gabriel and $600 at San Carlos."

Note 22. "Formerly the missionaries attended to the spiritual needs without any salary whatever, and since the year 1811 without their sínodos (with the exception of three years) which were never paid from the property of the Indians, but from the Pious Fund destined for that purpose. Here we find another burden placed upon the property of the Indians which it never had before; and yet the Proclamation pretends to desire the welfare of the Indians! Here it must be remarked that the mission or pueblo of San Gabriel as well as that of San Carlos has numerous settlements and ranches of white people who need spiritual attention. Yet the Proclamation says nothing that they should contribute to the support of the priest, but only disposes that his decent maintenance shall be paid from the fund of the goods of the Indians. I now ask, is it just that when the

[2] "cuando su P. Ministro á veces no ha tenido pan que comer."

whites are benefited as well as the Indians, the latter alone should bear the burden of the support of the priest? I do not speak for ourselves; for with the help of God we shall always continue to assist them out of charity; but why must our successors[3] be tied down to do the same? Why are tithes and the support of the priests imposed upon the Indians and nothing upon the whites, even when they are more numerous and possess more? Perhaps it will be said that the whites pay tithes. To whom are they paid? To the Church? It is well known that they pay nothing to the Church. She prescribes no such tithes.[4] The allowance of the missionaries, that ceased in 1811, came from the Pious Fund alone, which was founded for that purpose."

Art. 24. "At the missions of San Francisco, San José, Santa Clara, San Juan Bautista, Soledad, San Antonio, San Miguel, Santa Inés, San Buenaventura, San Fernando, San Juan Capistrano, and San Diego commissaries, administrators and mayordomos will be chosen as provided for in articles 2, 3, 4, 18 and 20; but in other respects they will continue under the community system until the land comisionados shall have finished their task at San Gabriel and San Carlos."

Note 23. "In this article there is noticed a great partiality in the secularization of certain missions which is absent in others. No order is observed, nor is it possible to guess what aim was in view in this matter. Most remarkable, however, and at the same time quite contradictory is the pretext of the first 'Whereas,' and that is the freedom of the Indians. This article leaves them in the condition in which they used to be—except for the many additional burdens on their property—with the difference that they are passed from fatherly hands to such as are salaried. The unhappy neophytes would lose nothing by being left in the hands in which they have been so many years, whilst the

[3] That is to say, secular priests.

[4] In New Spain, including California, tithes were collected by royal or government officers. The Church, as was said in the preceding volume, had nothing to do with them.

trial was being made at San Gabriel and San Carlos, in order to learn what might be the result of the distribution of lands, goods, etc."

Art. 25. "The administrators will furnish the missionaries of these missions with subsistence and servants in addition to their sínodos until a proper allowance for their spiritual services is determined."

Note 24. "I confess that, according to the style of the world, the missionaries ought to be content with the arrangements proposed by this article, if what is said on paper would only come into practice, inasmuch as they would improve their condition, speaking in a worldly manner; for there would be annual allowances and food, whereas now there are no stipends, and the missionaries must earn their food by their own labor and that of the poor Indians. I doubt not the good faith of the author,[5] but what I doubt, and that not a little, is that there could be such food, or such *mutton* as the refrain has it, because the Indians would be scattered, and more so their property, as has happened in Sonora. The encumbrances of the property of the Indians also come to mind. It is not they, but the Pious Fund which ought to pay the stipends of the Fathers."

Article 26. "At the missions of Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, Purisima, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Rey only commissaries and mayordomos shall be chosen; the administration for the present shall remain with the Fathers."

Note 25. "I should wish to know why in the missions mentioned in this article the Indians are left in charge of the missionaries. I should wish to know, I say, the reason for this partiality. *What? Do these neophytes already enjoy liberty?* Or is it for lack of a sufficient number suitable to be administrators? The article would seem to suppose as

[5] Fr. Durán may put a kind construction on Echeandía's action with regard to this point, but it is scarcely to be supposed that said official or his confederates scrupled very much about how the missionaries fared, when they are seen to worry so little about the fate of the Indians.

much. Yet, the truth is, that administrators of the same cast and calibre as those assigned *in pectore* [6] for the other missions there are more than enough."

Art. 27. "In the future Mission San Francisco will depend upon the port of the same name; the missions of San José and Santa Clara will be subject to the town council of San José; Santa Cruz, San Juan Bautista, Soledad, San Antonio, San Miguel, and San Luis Obispo will be subject to that of Monterey; Purisima, Santa Barbara, and San Buenaventura will pertain to the presidio of Santa Barbara; San Fernando and San Juan Capistrano will belong to the town council of Los Angeles; and San Luis Rey and San Diego to the presidio of San Diego."

Note 26. "This entire article from the first to last word is arbitrary and unconstitutional, because the law of September 13th, 1813, presupposes that all Indian pueblos shall have their own town council or ayuntamiento. If they have, they cannot be subject to pueblos of white people, as the two classes regard each other in the spirit of jealousy, and it means to put the Indians in worse slavery than in the time of the Alcaldes Mayores." [7]

Art. 28. "With all possible haste schools shall be opened, one at San Gabriel and one at Carmelo, in which reading, writing, and arithmetic as well as the best morals and politics shall be taught."

Note 27. "Much noise is made about schooling in California, but it is only to hoodwink those far away. This territory has seven settlements of people who are called 'people of intelligence' to distinguish them from the aborigines. They are the four presidios and three pueblos [8] with many ranches. Well, how many wretched apologies for schools will people who live far away think are in these seven white settlements? If those at a distance guess that there are three, let

[6] That is to say, already had in view, but not published.

[7] During the first half of the 18th century in Mexico; they oppressed the people.

[8] Los Angeles, Branciforte near Santa Cruz, and San José.

them know that there are no more. This is partly due to the lack of sufficient support, but especially to the lack of suitable subjects. Now I ask, can there be anything that will excite more laughter in one who beholds the situation here than this prating about schools for the Indians, when not even ignorant schoolmasters are to be found for the other race? No one here can dissimulate the specific disease of this territory which is the cause of its insignificance. It is this: To begin anything of advantage or to effect any improvement no one ever knows how to plan anything except with the aid of the Indians, whereas the white people should be the ones to coax and lead by word and example, but that is a labor unheard of in California. If there is anything to be done, the Indian has to do it; if he fails to do it, nothing will be done. Is anything to be planted? the Indian must do it. Is the wheat to be harvested? Let the Indian come. Are adobes or tiles to be made, a house to be erected, a corral to be built, wood to be hauled, water to be brought for the kitchen, etc.? Let the Indian do it. You wish to speak about arts, industry, manufactures, schooling and everything in the world? Do not count on any one except the Indian, just as though only the Indian were the son of Adam and the rest had no hands; but what about the other class which calls itself 'people of intelligence'? Nothing. With them it is walk about, play the gentleman, eat, be idle, etc., generally at the cost of the Indian's hard labor, so that in reality it seems as if nature had destined the Indian to be the slave of the 'people of intelligence.' This is so certain and such a general rule that it has but exceedingly few exceptions.

"The proof is contained in this very article. No one till now has thought of schools for the education of the many white children in the presidios, pueblos and ranches, the majority of whom grow up with only the education which nature affords.[9] Far from beginning with them to give a good

[9] "Nadie hasta ahora ha pensado en pupilage para educar á tanto muchacho de razon como hay en presidios, pueblos y ranchos de los cuales la mayor parte crecen, con la sola educacion de la naturaleza."

example on the subject of Christian and civil education, Echeandía has the mania of beginning with the Indian. It is not necessary to ask who will do the work of erecting and arranging suitable school buildings, with what funds they shall be maintained and kept in repair, and a thousand other things, for I know the old reply, and it is always: *the Indian, the Indian, and always the Indian, and again the Indian.* The very ones that maintain themselves with the substance and hard labor of the unhappy Indian are complaining that in this country there are no arts, no industry, no manufactures, etc., and everybody is planning how to introduce them among the Indians, when the little that exists of all this, is among those same Indians alone, whereas among the white classes there is nothing, nothing, nothing. Why do they not for a moment leave the Indians in peace, and then make projects for those who are not Indians so that they might give the example to those who are Indians? Those who but yesterday were savages must take the lead and teach the 'people of intelligence'!"

Art. 31. "Each of the southern missions will send four clear-headed pupils over eighteen years of age to San Diego school, and each of the northern missions from Purisima up will send four pupils to the Carmelo school. The pupils are to be chosen by the comisarios and administradores."

Note 28. "When will this be? That is to say, when will it come to pass that teachers will be obtained and schools erected for the Indians, since in fifty years not a teacher who put his foot in any presidio or pueblo of the 'people of intelligence' could succeed?"

Art. 32. "The teachers are to have $40 or $50 a month; and they shall have $15 for each proficient pupil produced in six months." [10]

---

[10] This was, as Fr. Durán said before, nothing but claptrap to deceive outsiders. Many modern writers were deceived, inasmuch as they blamed the friars for the ignorance of booklearning among the Indians, whereas the white Californians were just as ignorant, and wilfully so.

Note 29. "Where are the funds for such salaries and premiums of which this article speaks? They might have been pointed out on paper since this costs little; but even on paper we do not see them."

Epilogue.

"It would be better not to make so much noise, nor to introduce such a great innovation among the Indians, without first beginning with the class called 'people of intelligence.' Let these begin the work of establishing schools, etc., to introduce arts, factories, industries, etc., then it will be time to discuss how to induce the Indians to follow their good example; but all this scheming to extract the marrow out of the Indians, who but yesterday were savages, after having squeezed so much out of them at various periods,[11] so that to this date it is calculated that the amount reaches very nearly a million dollars, which in military fashion have been taken from the missions for the support of the soldiery during the last twenty years; all this scheming, I say, to extract more marrow out of poor people who but yesterday were savages,[12] and to leave in their endemic sloth the others who as a general rule know nothing more than horse-racing, in truth, I do not comprehend from what spirit this can proceed, or I should rather say that I understand it but too well, and that beneath the specious plan—; but why should I go about merely contemplating a matter which is notorious throughout California? Why should I not write what all say? Why speak in whispers, when all say it aloud? I should not merely give my personal impression, but voice the general opinion. I should not only say what I believe, but what all believe. Now what all believe is, that, under the

[11] "Pero tanto proyectar para sacar jugo de los Indios, que ayer eran salvages, despues de haberlos exprimidos tanto en diversas epocas."

[12] Comparatively, of course; but many were indeed very recent converts, for savages from the other side of the mountains were continually joining the missions.

specious pretext of this Plan, there was a secret project of a general plunder of the mission property in return for the said enormous sacrifice of about a million dollars in drafts against the nation, by selling and converting into cash everything possible. This the leaders intended to take along out of the country in order to enjoy it in foreign lands.[13] God, however, so willed that when this Proclamation was issued Lieutenant-Colonel Manuel Victoria should arrive to assume the military and civil command of this territory.

"Seeing the irregularity of the Proclamation, and how it opposed the ideas and instructions of the Supreme Government, he ordered its suspension until orders should be received from the Supreme Authority. Those interested, among whom were some of the deputies of the territorial assembly, who already counted on the spoils, were disappointed. From disappointment they passed to hatred of the just Victoria. They never have been able to forgive the honest governor for having snatched away the prey which they thought already in their clutches. They began to plot, to meet, and correspond secretly, and for the period of ten months in 1831 symptoms of sedition were observed which kept the illustrious governor in continual anxiety. They wanted to force him to call together the territorial deputies in order to see whether they could not accomplish their desires in some apparently legal manner, either by making the governor who had put obstacles in their way yield to them, or by deposing him from his office and ejecting him from the territory under other pretenses so that they could remove the opposition which they had encountered, ungrateful for the said sacrifices of the poor Indians. Inasmuch as this was known to the said governor he could never decide in favor of such assembly meeting until the last days of November of aforesaid

[13] "Que todos creen es: que bajo el pretexto especioso de este plan habia otro secreto de un saqueo general de los bienes de las misiones, . . . vendiendo, reduciendo á dinero todo cuanto se pudiese, y saliendo los principales á disfrutarlo en territorios estrangeros."

year 1831, when the plotters at the port of San Diego proclaimed a plan of attack against the person of Governor Victoria. They carried it out on December 5th of the same year in the neighborhood of the Pueblo of Our Lady of the Angels, where one was killed and one wounded of either party, Governor Victoria himself being the one seriously wounded on his side. The result of this wounding of the representative of the Supreme Government by armed enemies was that the territory remained in a state of anarchy. These facts are notorious and public to all the inhabitants of Alta California. It confirms the public opinion as to the resentment that arose from the obstacle to the plunder of the property of the poor Indians. The revolters have clearly demonstrated what low ideas they have of the General Government of the Mexican Federation, inasmuch as they thought that they could commit so many excesses with impunity. They would not await the decision of the Supreme Government, and thereby declared that they had no other motives to impeach the political conduct of Don Victoria than that he wanted to save the property of the poor neophytes which was continually in danger of falling into the claws of the covetous. Mission San José, December 31st, 1831. Fr. Narciso Durán." [14]

[14] Fr. Durán, "Notas."—"Santa Barbara Archives."

CHAPTER VII.

Carlos Carrillo's Splendid Address before the Mexican Congress in Behalf of the Missions and the Mission Fund.—Results.—Nativism.—Mexican Friars from Zacatecas Go to California.—Authority of the Leader of the Missionary Band.—He Administers Confirmation.—Return to Mexico.—Fr. Durán Sends Fr. Peiri to Mexico.—Object.—Fr. Peiri's Noble Character.—Calumnies of the Pico Clique.—Forbes on Fr. Peiri.—Two Governors in California.—Echeandía's Last Attempt.—Replies of Fathers Martin, Oliva, Zalvidea, and Ánzar.

MEANWHILE Carlos Carrillo,[1] who in October 1830 had been elected to represent Upper California in Congress, reached Mexico in April 1831. During the session of that year a discussion arose about the dispositions to be made of the Pious Fund Estates, which had been in the control of the various governments ever since 1767. During the last twenty years they had become almost unproductive, and were now slowly dwindling. From 1811, save for the years 1819-1823,[2] the estates had furnished no aid to the Upper California missions. It was now proposed to sell them and turn the proceeds over to the national treasury. Don Carlos prepared a strong argument against the sale, and had it published in pamphlet form.[3]

The California representative argued that it was wrong to divert the Pious Fund to other uses than those pointed out by the donors. The Fund, he said, owed its foundation to

[1] He was a brother-in-law of José de la Guerra of Santa Barbara.

[2] About $40,000 were deposited with Síndico Martiarena, who probably purchased goods with the money for the Fathers, though we have no evidence that anything reached California. See pp. 247-249.

[3] "Exposicion, Dirigida á la Cámara de Diputados del Congreso de la Union," por Carlos Antonio Carrillo. Mexico, September 15th, 1831. It is the first production of a native California writer which was ever printed in book or pamphlet form, says Bancroft, iii, 215. Copy in Santa Barbara Archives.

the piety of various persons who made donations of their wealth or part of it for the exclusive purpose of maintaining missions for the propagation of the Catholic Faith and the conversion of the barbarous tribes of California. These donations, which partly consisted of real estate and partly of money ultimately converted into real estate, constituted the so-called Pious Fund.[4] From its revenues the stipends of the missionaries had been paid until 1810; and, though since that date little or nothing had reached Upper California, the missionary Fathers had continued their apostolic labors with such success that, whatever might be asserted, to them was due the prosperous condition of the territory which little more than sixty years before was an uncultivated waste inhabited by savages.[5] The civilization of California, such as it was, its agriculture, its numerous herds of every kind, its mechanical arts, its commerce, the subjugation and conversion of thousands of vagabond savages, and their willingness to till the soil, engage in mechanical pursuits, and become useful members of society, was all exclusively due to the missionaries.[6]

Carrillo's address developed into a veritable panegyric which, though richly deserved, must have appeared a strange novelty where, as among the bawling young Californians, denunciation of friars had been the fashion. The missionaries, accustomed to be slandered and vilified, must have disbelieved their eyes when they first read the report of their courageous defender's memorial. No one but an enemy of the missions could have begrudged the venerable old men

---

[4] For the history and vicissitudes of the Pious Fund see Volume I.

[5] "Á los misioneros se debe (dígase lo que se quiera) el estado en que se halla aquel territorio, que poco mas hace de sesenta años era una tierra inculta, habitada por salvages."

[6] "Su civilizacion, tal cual es, su agricultura y multiplicación asombrosa de ganados de toda clases, sus artes, el comercio, la reducción de muchos millares de gentiles vagabundos y errantes, y convertirlos en hombres capaces del trato social; todo es debido esclusivamente á los misioneros."

whatever consolation this vindication conveyed after years of cheerless toil and unjust persecution.

The Congressman spoke the truth, though not the whole truth, for he wisely addressed Congress from the standpoint of a statesman only. Leaving the question of Religion aside, as that would not have carried weight with men who for the most part sought only what was earthly, he said that, "Even if the missions had been of no more benefit to the public than to prepare those savage tribes for the civilization of which they are capable, they would have caused them to make great strides; for the difference between the savage of the interior and the mission neophyte is remarkable. Only the persistent patience of the missionaries, who by their Institute are absolutely devoted to such hardships, could effect such progress in that line.[7] At all events, no others but such as they could give themselves up to the painful occupation of taking hundreds of people from barbarism, and overcome the obstacles which Indian nature and stupidity oppose to render them useful to themselves and to society. Such work is one of a merit whose value can only be judged by approaching those establishments and witnessing their activity.

"During the troubles of the past twenty years," Carrillo went on, "the missions have not only been self-supporting, but have contributed to the amount of half a million dollars for the maintenance of the troops. In addition they offered the only encouragement to a growing and profitable commerce. In other words, California has been sustained and saved for Mexico by the earnings of the Indians under the mission system; and but for the missions the territory to-day would be in possession of savages or of a foreign power." Carrillo insisted that only by maintaining the missions, and by founding new ones in savage regions, could the country be saved from aggression. Nor would this involve any expense to the national treasury. The Pious Fund existed for that purpose; by applying it to the missions the territory itself

[7] "Solo la paciencia constante de los misioneros, como que por su insituto están dedicados esclusivamente á estos trabajos, puede hacer tales progresos en esta línea.

would be benefited. Policy as well as duty dictated that Mexico make the Pious Fund Estates productive, and apply the revenues to the support and extension of the California missions.[8]

Don Carlos Carrillo won the victory; for his propositions, embodied in thirteen articles and attached to his Exposicion, were almost literally incorporated into the Law of May 25th, 1832, by which the Pious Fund Estates were ordered rented for terms not exceeding seven years and the product devoted exclusively to the missions.[9] Unfortunately, the victory was a barren one, as far as Upper California was concerned. Succeeding administrations were not disposed to see the missions benefited in any way whilst they were controlled by unselfish religious; "nor could they under any system have obtained their dues while Mexican revolutionary troubles continued," Bancroft correctly remarks.[10]

We have already alluded to the action of the Mexican Government which early endeavored to replace the Spanish-born friars with native Franciscans from the College of Our Lady of Guadalupe, Zacatecas. The Mexican politicians, who regarded themselves as the State, of course cared nothing for the gain or loss of Religion among the Indians. Had their conception of Religion been thoroughly Christian, they would not have inquired where the cradle of a Gospel-messenger might have stood, as long as he was recognized by the proper ecclesiastical authority; for they would have known to a certainty that such messengers of the Gospel teach obedience to the established civil or military authority everywhere. As it was, the Mexican politicians had emancipated themselves from the Law of Christ. In addition they were filled with narrow nativism, and therefore they denied the messenger of Christ the right to exercise his ministry if he happened to be born under other, notably Spanish, skies.

---

[8] Carlos Carrillo, "Exposicion." "Santa Barbara Archives."

[9] "Appendix II, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1902. United States vs. Mexico." Washington, 1903.

[10] Bancroft, iii, 313; Gleeson, "Catholic Church," ii, 136.

Doubtless Christ and His Apostles would have been excluded in Mexico and California where at that time such childish policy prevailed. Nor cared those officials for the native born priests and religious, except, as in California just then, in so far as they could be utilized to execute political whims and aims.[11] It was for this reason that the administration which preceded the Bustamante Government ordered the College of Guadalupe, entirely composed of Mexicans, to replace the Spanish missionaries in California with native friars.[12] The College could not provide the number required. It therefore agreed with the College of San Fernando to accept the missions in the northern part of California. The Fathers of the missions were not consulted; but, as twenty years before they had suggested such a division in favor of the Orizaba College, it was presumed that all would acquiesce in this arrangement.[13]

The Commissary Prefect of the Zacatecas missions of Guadalupe was Fr. Francisco García Diego y Moreno. He appointed Fr. Mariano Sosa his vice-commissary, and sent him with the three Fathers Francisco Cuculla, Jesus María Martínez, and Antonio Ánzar to California, for the purpose, it seems, of paving the way for a more numerous band of missionaries. They must have travelled by way of Lower California, for we find Fr. Sosa on March 20th, 1831, at the Dominican mission of Rosário baptizing two persons, one of

---

[11] In reply to the request of Síndico Juan Bautista Martiarena of Tepíc that the government reimburse Mission San Luis Obispo to the amount of $9000 due from the judge of the Western District, the Minister of Justice and Ecclesiastical Relations, Juan José Espinosa, on October 19th, 1831, stated that the interests of the missions did not pertain to the National Treasury. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[12] Minister Juan de Dios Cañedo as early as March 20th, 1829, wrote to the governor that "the Apostolic College of Zacatecas would provide missionaries to take the places of the two fugitives Ripoll and Altimira." "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap., Decrees and Despatches, iv, 184-186. See chapter xv, section i, this volume.

[13] Fr. Arreguín to Fr. Sánchez, Mexico, July 2nd, 1831; Fr. Durán, "Circular," January 23rd, 1833. "Sta. Barb. Arch."; Sotomayor, "Historia del Colegio de Guadalupe," 515; 523.

whom was José Manuel, a Yuma Indian eighteen years of age.[14] The Fathers must have arrived and presented themselves to Fr. Presidente Sánchez at San Gabriel during the month of April, for the baptismal records show that Fr. Cuculla baptized there on April 28th.[15]

Fr. Presidente José Sánchez reported the arrival of the four Zacatecas Fathers to the Fr. Superior of San Fernando College. At the same time he expressed his surprise that Fr. Sosa came with the title of vicario foraneo and claimed to possess the faculty of giving Confirmation. Inasmuch as the presidente of the missions by grant of the Bishops of Sonora was always vicario foraneo of Upper California, it seemed strange that another should be sent with the same authority. In reply Fr. Arreguín, by order of Fr. Guardian José Maria Guzmán, urged peace, and informed the Fr. Presidente that as vice-comisario prefecto Fr. Sosa undoubtedly was authorized by Papal Bulls, granted the apostolic colleges, to confirm in the regions under the jurisdiction of his own College. As to the appointment of vicario foraneo, this was a matter which pertained to the Bishop of the diocese.[16]

Meanwhile Fr. Sánchez's term of office expired, as stated elsewhere, and Fr. Narciso Durán's appointment arrived in June 1831.[17] Fr. Sosa thereupon resigned the office of

---

[14] Baptismal Record of Mission Rosário, now at the Dominican Monastery, Benicia, Cal. He signed himself "Vice-Comisario y Vicario Foraneo."

[15] Libro de Bautismos, San Gabriel.

[16] Fr. Arreguín to Fr. Sánchez, July 2nd, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch." The Very Rev. Camilo Orranea, administrator of the Diocese of Sonora, apparently knew not that the Fathers Presidente in California were ex officio vicarios foraneos, and for that reason conferred the title on Fr. Sosa. V. R. Orranea to Fr. Durán, November 21st, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[17] See chapter xviii, section i, this volume. Fr. Durán, June 16th, 1831, notified Gov. Victoria that he had received from the Fr. Guardian his appointment to the office of presidente, and that by directions of the Bishop of Sonora the offices of vicario foraneo and ecclesiastical judge were attached to the office of presidente of the California missions. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2101.

vicario foraneo, which was then, as had been the custom, conferred upon the new Fr. Presidente by the administrator of the Diocese of Sonora.[18] Fr. Durán, however, permitted Fr. Sosa to exercise his privilege of confirming. Accordingly we find him administering the Sacrament of Confirmation at San Gabriel and Los Angeles from November 3rd to 17th, 1831, to as many as seven hundred and four persons. The first one on the list was William Edward Hartnell, an English convert, who became prominent in the subsequent history of the missions.[19] Fr. Sosa also confirmed at San Diego, and probably at San Luis Rey.[20] His companions during all these months assisted the aged Fernandinos in the four southern missions and at Los Angeles. Fr. Cuculla, however, is on record as baptizing once on July 24th at San Buenaventura, and Fr. Sosa's name appears as officiating at a Baptism on August 29th at San Luis Obispo.[21] This is all so far discovered on the movements of these Fathers north of San Gabriel. While Fr. Anzar was definitely stationed at San Luis Rey to take the place of Fr. Antonio Peiri, Fr. Sosa with his other two companions returned to his College, probably on the same vessel which bore away the unfortunate ex-governor, Manuel Victoria, in January 1832. The result of his report to the College of Guadalupe will be related in its place.

In the meantime the spirit of insubordination aroused among the neophytes, and the incessant slanders heaped upon the missionaries by Echeandía and the irreligious cabal of young Californians, had rendered conditions at the missionary establishments well-nigh insufferable. Since the Picos, Bandinis, Vallejos and other confederates blamed the Fathers for all the ills of the country, in revenge for not being free

---

[18] V. R. Orranea to Fr. Durán, ut supra.

[19] Libro de Confirmaciones, San Gabriel and Los Angeles. Not since Fr. Lasuén's term, twenty-eight years before, had Confirmation been administered in Upper California.

[20] The records of San Luis Rey thus far have not been located.

[21] Libro de Bautismos of San Buenaventura and San Luis Obispo.

to loot the missions, Fr. Durán resolved to take steps which would withdraw him and his brethren from ceaseless insults, and remove the excuse for hostility to the missions. "On account of the misfortunes which have occurred," he wrote to Fr. Antonio Peiri, the vice-presidente, "in order to prevent the ruin and desolation which the missions are going to suffer, and because of the horrible oppression [22] exercised upon the missionaries, I have been thinking of personally going to the College, or of commissioning another religious, in order to present what might contribute to procure us our passports and bring priests hither to receive the missions. As I cannot myself go, I have thought of Your Reverence. You might surrender your mission to a Father of San Diego or to one of the Zacatecanos, without giving any reason save that of a journey, and then proceed by way of Lower California.

"If for some unforeseen circumstance it seem better to embark with Don Victoria,[23] and there be no time to await my instructions, you may go in virtue of this letter. You will represent to the College and to the Government our intolerable oppression and peril from our cruel enemies, and our inability to continue in the service of the missions on account of our old age, physical maladies, and exhaustion. You will urge that priests should be sent hither to take the missions from us, and that we be given our passports to retire to the College, if the Government should permit, or to Europe.[24] In this case the Government should command that the expenses of our voyage to Europe be paid from

---

[22] "horrible opresión."

[23] the ex-governor, who at San Luis Rey was recovering from his wounds and waiting for an opportunity to embark for Mexico.

[24] "hacer presente nuestra insoportable opresión y peligro por parte de enemigos crueles; nuestra imposibilidad de continuar en el servicio de las misiones por nuestra vejez, achaques y fatigas: y que vengan Sacerdotes á recibir esta Christiandad, etc." How it was possible for the mission enemies still to insist that the friars clung to the mission property can be explained only on the ground of malice.

the funds of the missions, because they have flourished by means of our toil and our stipends which we expended on them.[25] Although, by reason of pressing circumstances and difficulties, this letter leaves not provided with the required formalities, it is my intention that it should have the same force as though it had been sent supplied with all the customary formalities, and that Your Reverence proceed to execute the instructions contained in this letter with all the necessary authority and permissions which are all granted to you in virtue of this. Moreover, *I declare to you that your services in these missions for the period of thirty-five years are praiseworthy to an heroic degree, and entitle you to all the honors of the Order.* May Your Reverence fare well, and let me know your determination." [26]

Fr. Durán's letter was penned at Mission San José on December 17th, and therefore had to travel overland about six hundred miles in order to reach its destination, San Luis Rey. When it arrived Fr. Peiri barely had time for the necessary preparations before embarking on the American ship that bore the noble-minded Victoria, and sailed on January 17th, 1832. Without consulting any one, as directed, the venerable Father, now about seventy years of age, gave the Zacatecan Fr. Antonio Anzar the necessary information on the state of the mission, and then secretly hastened aboard the *Pocahontas*. There probably was no need of secrecy as far as the government officials were concerned. Fr. Peiri had enthusiastically taken the oath of independence and the oath of allegiance to the Mexican Constitution; but he soon

---

[25] Fr. Peiri, for example, who had founded San Luis Rey and for thirty-three years had put his stipends, all his earnings and donations into the fund of that mission. The Government was justly expected to pay the expenses of the journey, when it intended to drive the Fathers out of the country, since they possessed absolutely nothing.

[26] "Declarándole que sus servicios en estas misiones por espacio de 35 años son laudables en grado heroico y acreedores á todos los premios de la Orden." Fr. Durán to Fr. Peiri, December 17th, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Italics are ours.

noticed the trend of politics in Mexico. He asked to be relieved of the management of the mission temporalities as early as 1826; but no sooner had the decree of expulsion of the Spaniards been published, than the disillusioned friar demanded his passports. Echeandía refused them, and informed Fr. Peiri that the Supreme Government had been asked to exempt him from the decree of expulsion. Fr. Peiri nevertheless demanded his passports [27] which it seems had not been delivered. So he went without them. As there was a substitute in the person of Fr. Anzar, the governor could hardly detain him. According to Bancroft, the Government of Mexico had granted the request to retire with full payment of the past stipends. For thirty-five years at $400 a year this sum would amount to $14,000; but, according to Bancroft himself, the good friar took along only $3000, which he thought necessary to cover the expenses for himself and two native youths to Mexico, and thence to Rome where he intended to place the two Indians in a college for higher studies. After that he would scarcely have enough to make the voyage to his native Spain.[28]

It was more owing to consideration for his beloved Indians that Fr. Peiri chose to leave the mission secretly, as they would probably have prevented his departure had they been aware of his intentions. The tradition is that when the

---

[27] Fr. Peiri to Echeandía, August 29th; Echeandía to Fr. Peiri, September 11th; Fr. Peiri to Echeandía, September 25th, 1829. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 2068; 2070. Fr. Durán about the same time demanded his passport for Habana on the ground that he suffered so much from gout that his feet were crippled. Echeandía agreed if Fr. Durán's prelate would furnish a substitute for Mission San José. Fr. Durán to Echeandía, January 13th, 1831. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2100; Echeandía to Fr. Durán, January 23rd, 1831. "Cal. Arch.," Missions & Colon. ii, 194-195. Another proof of many that the mission enemies misrepresented the Franciscans when they everlastingly charged that the friars from selfish motives refused to surrender the management of the mission property. The friars would not cede their trust to robbers, but only to the rightful owners or to lawful government. This is the truth.

[28] "California," iii, 621.

FR. ANTONIO PEIRI DEPARTING BLESSES HIS BELOVED INDIANS.

neophytes discovered the absence of their fatherly protector, suspecting the truth, five hundred of them hurried to San Diego to intercept him and bring him back; but they barely came in time to receive his blessing from the vessel as it sailed out of the harbor.[29]

It is scarcely credible, but the *paisano* chiefs, who had forced themselves to the front by means of the unscrupulousness and bluster in keeping with their character, hesitated not to besmirch the good name of this noble priest and venerable old missionary who had deserved so well of the country, and whom the very Government of Mexico and even Echeandía held in esteem. Here follow specimens of which the mission enemies were capable. Pío Pico asserted that he had it from Juan Mariner, a Catalonian, whom Fr. Peiri had befriended and trusted, that the San Luis Rey missionary took along thirty-two barrels of olives, each containing money. Mariano Vallejo[30] made it fourteen barrels of flour, and said that the San Blas customs officer refused to land the suspicious cargo. Leandro Serrano, sometime mayordomo of San Luis Rey Mission, talked of ten kegs of silver dollars, passed off as brandy.[31] The enemies of Victoria also accuse Fr. Peiri of having contributed large sums of money to support Victoria's cause. All these stories are too strong for even a Bancroft, for he closes the enumeration with the remark, "I suppose all this to be unfounded."[32]

Alexander Forbes, an English Protestant then residing at

---

[29] Bancroft, iii, 210; 621-622.

[30] Vallejo proves even worse than a pagan Indian in that his wild stories emanate from pure malice, not like the Indian's from a desire to please or to say something. To the Picos, Vallejos, and other such early Californians the words of a well known writer apply with treble force: "A man is always capable himself of a sin which he thinks another is capable of, or which he himself is capable of imputing to another." Fr. Faber, "Conferences," p. 46.

[31] We suspect that Mariner and Serrano had learned the Indian way of hoaxing people to the full extent of their demands. They knew that Pico wanted to hear just such a story; he was accommodated. See vol. i, Appendix G.

[32] Bancroft, iii, 622.

Tepic, but whose strong bias had failed to make him bid farewell to common sense as the said Californians had done, writes of Fr. Peiri: "I had the pleasure of seeing Father Peiri on his way to Mexico. After a constant residence of thirty-four years at this place,[33] he left it stocked with nearly sixty thousand head of domesticated animals *of all sorts*,[34] and yielding an annual produce of about thirteen thousand bushels of grain, while the population amounted to nearly three thousand Indians! He left also a complete set of buildings, including a church with inclosures, etc. Yet after these thirty-four years of incessant labor, in which he expended the most valuable part of his life, the worthy Peiri left his mission with only what he judged to be sufficient to enable him to join his convent in the City of Mexico, where he threw himself upon the charity of his Order." [35]

After Victoria's departure the government of the territory, as we have stated before, was divided between Echeandía and Zamorano. The former by agreement was permitted to rule from San Gabriel south, the latter held sway from San Fernando north. The legislative assembly with Pico was ignored. Agustín Zamorano, the really legitimate temporary ruler of California, treated the missionaries with some degree of deference. At least, the notorious territorial assembly composed of Pico and his fellow conspirators could make no more progress under Zamorano against the missions than under Victoria. The result was that the Pico cabal hated him almost as much as they hated Victoria and the missionaries; and as the foreign, law-abiding inhabitants supported Zamorano they were likewise abused without stint. In an address to the Mexican President the Pico gang on May 15th, 1832, declared that Zamorano's action in as-

[33] Mission San Luis Rey.

[34] The figures are correct, and were doubtless furnished by Fr. Peiri. The wild assertions of some writers that the mission possessed 70,000 head of cattle and 68,000 sheep can be traced to the mission enemies, who had an object in making such statements. See Appendix F.

[35] Forbes, "California," 228-229.

suming the government had been wholly uncalled for, and that many of the statements in his pronunciamento were false. They more than hinted that his movement had been in the interest of Spain. At the end of December they voted to send a protest to Zamorano for violating the law by preventing an election, and then adjourned because the term of several members expired.[36]

In the south Echeandía lorded it over the four unhappy missions under his sway with his usual high-handedness.[37] In order to sustain himself against a possible attack from Zamorano, he in the beginning called to his standard and armed the neophytes that flocked to him from the four missions. A few from San Fernando also joined him. Protests from all sides at last opened his eyes to the danger of assaults from the Indians.[38] After his truce with Zamorano he therefore sent them back to their missions, but with the warning to the missionaries that the truants should not be punished.[39]

Fr. Ibarra of Mission San Fernando, reporting the situation to Fr. Presidente Durán, described the results of Echeandía's acts as follows: "Fr. Sánchez of San Gabriel found himself without hands to perform the work at the mission, for the neophytes are now valorous soldiers between San Juan Capistrano and San Diego; but he was also rid of his enemies, if we may call them such, until the 14th of June when an officer arrived here on his way to San Gabriel. He escorted fifteen of our Indians, who had run away to Echeandía, persuaded that said gentleman would be the protector

---

[36] Bancroft, iii, 228-229. See Hittell, ii, 150-154.

[37] "Echeandía and his party were draining San Juan Capistrano and the splendid Mission of San Luis Rey of their possessions." Robinson, 135.

[38] "Daily reports were received of robberies and murders committed by Indians at San Diego. Stabbings were frequent at San Juan Capistrano and San Luis Rey; and the drunken Indian, as he staggered along from the scene of debauch ejaculated, 'Soy libre!' 'I am free!'" Robinson, 135.

[39] Bancroft, iii, 227; Hittell, ii, 151.

of their vices. Two or three days later Echeandía sent me a letter with orders not to punish them. In the same letter he holds me responsible in case I should chastise them, and on the same occasion he told me to reply without loss of time by means of the officer. I did so immediately, whereupon the officer retired. From the letter of J. Mancisidor Your Reverence will be enabled to infer what must be the discouragement of the poor Fathers who see themselves compelled to live in such slavery." [40]

The Mexican Government at last came to a decision, and on May 9th, 1832, appointed José Figueroa, since 1820 comandante-general of Sonora, governor of California. Although the news arrived in July, and Echeandía on the 28th in an address expressed his satisfaction, he audaciously attempted to force action against the missions on the part of the new governor by resorting to an artifice similar to the one employed in the case of Victoria. "Echeandía," says Bancroft, "had the assurance to meditate the enforcement of his decree [41] by preparing on November 18th, 1832, a supplementary reglamento, as if the events of the past months had been a mere temporary interruption of his plans. The document was intended to apply only to the four southernmost missions.[42] It did not go so far in some respects as was provided by the decree of January 6th, 1831, but introduced some new features not authorized by that decree. It was prefaced with an argument on the necessity of secular-

[40] "Á los mismos que mandó á los dos ó tres dias con una carta para que no les castigase, y en ella me hacía responsable en caso de castigarlos, y juntamente que sin pérdida de tiempo respondiese á la suya por medio del oficial, lo que verifiqué inmediatamente y se retiró dicho oficial. . . . Podrá Su Reverencia inferir cual será el desconsuelo de los pobres Padres que se ven precisados á vivir en semejante esclavitud." Fr. Ibarra to Fr. Durán, June 22nd, 1832. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[41] January 6th, 1831.

[42] Echeandía, "Bando y Reglamento," November 18th, 1832. "Sta. Barb. Arch."—"Cal. Arch.," Missions & Colonization ii, 168-178. Echeandía was not recognized north of San Gabriel, as will be remembered.

ization under superior laws, a statement of the enthusiasm with which the Indians had welcomed the author's efforts, a presentment of their complaints of injustice and general discontent under the padres' management which threatened serious consequences, a mention of good results [43] at San Juan Capistrano, where the padres were said to have voluntarily given up the temporalities, and a plea to the missionaries to accept their duties as parish priests." [44]

This Bando and Reglamento Echeandía addressed to the missionaries of San Diego, San Luis Rey, San Juan Capistrano, and San Gabriel, and apparently to the Fr. Presidente at San José in the north. A copy was also sent to the Minister of Foreign and Interior Relations, Mexico, and another went to Governor Figueroa, who as yet had not arrived in the territory. The intent of the mischief-maker was plain enough. His authority had vanished, but before leaving California forever he would make one more effort to break up the mission system which stood in the way of the schemers against the Indian property. Probably the friars had not yet learned that the new governor was on his way, otherwise they might have treated Echeandía's last effusion with silent disregard. As it was, four of them did him the honor to reply. These answers throw some light on the state of the southern missions at the time, and give such additional proof of the utter detachment of the Fathers, that they deserve to be reproduced entire.

"After reading attentively the Bando and Reglamento, which under date of the 18th of this month you placed in our hands," Fathers Martin and Oliva of San Diego write on November 24th, "and after reflecting what we should do in such a delicate matter, we have decided to retain a copy and to forward the original to our Fr. Presidente, without whose knowledge or permission we cannot meddle with political subjects, for we are mere subordinates of our prelates through whose hands orders of this kind must come. We

[43] For these good results see notes 37 and 38 this chapter.

[44] Bancroft, iii, 314-315.

shall not oppose, nor do we oppose, whatever Your Honor may determine, for we continue here at this mission only for the spiritual welfare of these people. Since May 20th of this year the neophytes of this mission have already managed its temporalities without any meddling in their affairs on our part. If at any time anything has been said about the damage the little remaining property is suffering, it was



Signature of Father Fernando Martin.

because the waste in the management is notorious. Only the wine cellar has not been turned over to the Indians, because this has been regarded as not conducive to their corporal or spiritual well-being." [45]

"I received your esteemed letter of the 12th [46] of last month," writes the venerable Fr. Zalvidea of San Juan Capistrano. "Although ill and burdened with so many sick, I make use of the spare moments they left me to say that I desire nothing more than to be relieved of the temporal government of the Indians, because it has become very repugnant to us, and because I see the reasonableness of Your Honor's plan, which years ago should have been put into practice according to the plan and orders of the Court of Spain.[47] It is very advantageous to us missionaries person-

[45] Fathers Fernando Martín and Vicente Oliva to Echeandía, November 24th, 1832. "Vallejo Collection," xxxi, no. 25, University of California.

[46] It seems Echeandía had written a private letter to Fr. Zalvidea before circulating his Reglamento, unless the date be 21st.

[47] Doubtless he meant the plan of the Córtes of September 13th, 1813.

ally.[48] I served and managed the temporal and spiritual affairs of Mission San Gabriel for twenty-one years. Yet after putting in all the stipends, and the money received as alms for the celebration of holy Masses, I left everything for the benefit of that community, and have not taken away as much as half a reál.[49] We are sons of obedience, and, as we have been instructed by our Superiors that all orders and regulations of the civil and political government should come to us through the Superiors, I forwarded the Plan which Your Honor had the kindness to communicate to me to the Rev. Fr. Presidente." [50]

Fr. Sánchez of San Gabriel made no reply or more probably sent the Reglamento to Fr. Durán; but Fr. José Antonio de[51] Anzar of San Luis Rey, the only Zacatecan in the missions, replied under date of February 27th, 1833, when his brethren with Figueroa had already reached Monterey: "I have made myself acquainted with the articles of the Reglamento, which I find to be in order and very fair.[52] I will cooperate with pleasure, as I have told Your Honor on another occasion; but for this I must take a very necessary step, and that is to inform the Fr. Presidente,[53] as the Superior of the missions which are directly under his care, both in virtue of Apostolic Bulls and the direction of the Government. After the Superior has been informed, I can act freely, because he will tell me what I am to do. Señor,

---

[48] Insofar as it relieved them of the worry about the temporalities.

[49] Six and one-fourth cents. All the Fathers could have said the same.

[50] Father Zalvidea to Echeandía, November 12th (21st?), 1832. "Vallejo Collection," xxxi, no. 25, in University of California.

[51] He later on drops the "de."

[52] It would have been fair enough for civilized white people, but for the childish Indians it was most unwise and vicious; but see note 55.

[53] Fr. Anzar knew that his own Superior, Fr. García Diego, had arrived at Monterey, but he was holding a mission subject to Fr. Presidente Durán.

I have been in many missions;[54] at no time has either the secular or ecclesiastical government dealt with the Fathers directly, but with the Fr. Presidente and the College. Therefore I entreat Your Honor to relieve me of the responsibility, inasmuch as I like to do only what is commanded me.[55] I am a Mexican, yet as independent as any one that claims to be so."[56]

All this threw the burden of disproving the charges and assertions of the ex-governor and mischief-maker, and of showing the impracticability of the project as devised by Echeandía, upon Fr. Presidente Durán. We can forgive the ex-governor much for having caused the issuance of this precious document. Owing to the utter detachment of the friars, and to their love of silence, we should never have discovered the learning, virtue, and fortitude which the coarse habit and cowl, especially of the presidente, concealed, had not persecutors from Fages down to Echeandía forced it to the surface in brilliant papers such as the one which Fr. Durán now composed to squelch the irrepressible Echeandía and his covetous clique. He went to work quietly, and with his customary thoroughness mercilessly unmasked the real animus of the plotter and his confederates. Bancroft himself confesses that "this criticism is one to which it is impossible to do justice *en résumé*."[57] We shall therefore reproduce it entire in the next chapter.

---

[54] In Mexico, for he had arrived only the year before.

[55] Fr. Ánzar was diplomatic. With Echeandía near it was safer to speak thus.

[56] That is to say, he might hold political opinions as freely as any one, as long as they did not militate against Religion. Fr. Ánzar to Echeandía, February 27th, 1833. "Vallejo Collection," xxxi, 25.

[57] Bancroft, iii, 315-316. The historian erroneously attributes the authorship to Fr. Sánchez; but this Father at most only urged Fr. Durán to take up the cudgel. The Santa Barbara Archives contain the original draft and a complete transcript in Fr. Durán's hand. It was dated December 12th, 1832. Another copy by another hand shows some immaterial alterations.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Mission System.—The Wealth of the Missions the Result.—Indian Liberty.—The Friars not Parish Priests.—Filial Subjection not Slavery.—A Generous Proposition.—The Friars Will not Stultify Themselves to Aid Echeandía.—Neophytes Seduced by Echeandía.—Neophytes not Slaves.—False Charges of the Ex-Governor.—The Key to Echeandía's Misrepresentations.—Neophytes Regarded as Children or Apprentices.—Consequences of Echeandía's Machinations.—The Friars and the Temporalities.—Willing to Surrender Them to Lawful Authority.—Conclusion.

"Notes on the Circular or Bando of Don José María Echeandía Addressed to the Missionaries of the Four Missions in the South on November 18th, 1832."

NOTE 1. "On the words, 'I find no ancient or modern laws which give the Rev. Missionaries the permission to dispose at discretion of the liberty, occupations and goods of the converts, etc.' [1]

"To the Rev. Missionary Fathers the favor and justice must be accorded of believing that they have the necessary license from ancient and modern authorities, inasmuch as they have done nothing without their knowledge, consent and approbation, in order to dispose, not at despotic discretion, but with paternal and conscientious judgment, of the liberty, occupations and goods of the neophytes in their respective

[1] In his draft of the Notes, the paper which Bancroft seems to have seen, this is Note 2. Note 1 reads: "On the words, 'that he must subject himself to the laws, etc.'—Señor Echeandía might have saved himself the trouble of mentioning subjection to the laws, for two years have elapsed since his rule terminated. Moreover, he could have subjected himself to the laws whilst in office." Echeandía should have known that it was dangerous to challenge a missionary to a debate on the subject of missions. If he was thoroughly worsted, he at least learned that sophistry could not withstand the sound arguments of the fearless Fr. Durán.

missions according to the demands of inevitable necessity, for the purpose of attaining the ends of their mission on earth. For what object have the missionaries come here? They came to make sociable men and, above all, Christians of savages devoid of every kind of law and government, and scattered through the mountains and inaccessible tulares. It is certain that this would never have been accomplished had not the missionaries been enabled to dispose (at paternal discretion and subject to the supreme authorities as was the case indeed) of the liberty and occupations of the neophytes. By this means the wealth was produced upon which now some eyes are gazing with envious cupidity, and which without that license would never have been produced. What would these neophytes have produced, who are now about to be incorporated into civil and Christian society, if they had been left to their full liberty, which according to their character and natural bringing-up is nothing but abject idleness? Would these fields be covered with the wealth which remind the stranger of the fertility and abundance of his mother country? Would there be the number of cattle whose increase has aroused the interest of people thousands of leagues away, and to which it is due that the people do not run about stark naked? Would the presidios and troops have been supported without the necessary sacrifice of a part of the liberty of the neophytes? Would these neophytes have had, as they indeed have, coming to them from the nation more than one million dollars during the last twenty-two years alone?[2] These facts the very bando almost expressly confesses when it says a little before: 'That only the Indians, generally speaking, are the laborers, artisans, and servants for everything.' Well, this wealth, then, is the result of the license (which is disputed to the Rev. Missionary Fathers) of disposing of the liberty and occupations of the neophytes, and of the monopoly of these laborers of which the bando complains, but without which this wealth would never have been accumulated. Here, too, it is well to

[2] For supplies furnished the troops, and which remained unpaid.

remark that so much wealth, as the license (authorized by ancient and modern supreme authority) to dispose of the liberty and occupations of the natives in said manner has produced, was not the whole and only cause of the prosperity which is in sight of all. Something must also be attributed to the toil, the disinterestedness, the stipends and other alms which during more than sixty years the Missionary Fathers have contributed, and which stipends alone amount to many thousands of dollars, by means of which the missions have been reared and fostered; for all has been used for the common benefit of the Indians, as is evident from the records of the Memorias[3] which exist at the missions, and which, if we must not be Franciscan religious missionaries,[4] we have a legal right to have reimbursed to us, especially in these philosophic times in which, it seems, it is the determination to reduce us to beg alms for the necessary subsistence, though without hope of obtaining it. Those who complain of the monopolized labor of the neophytes should examine what the not monopolized labor of the separated or independent Indians produces, when they will see that what they produce are *grave evils to themselves as well as to the towns,* as in the same words Don Echeandía confesses in the bando of January 6th, 1831, in the third 'Whereas.'

"What if the Señor finds in the Laws of the Indies regulations for the liberty, good treatment, and free use of the fruits of the property and labor of the neophytes? No missionary denies this; rather is it certain that no one has defended this better than they.[5] It must be borne in mind that though the free administration had to be denied to the neophytes, they being minors as indeed they are with regard to their character, this has not prevented them from enjoying the whole fruit of their labor and even that of the missionaries. This is a fact so indisputable that even Echeandía

[3] List of goods purchased in Mexico with the stipends of the friars. See Appendix H.

[4] That is to say, if the friars are to be mere parish curates.

[5] The admonition came with bad grace from the ex-governor.

himself cannot gainsay it; for it is they who enjoy the produce in the barns; it is they to whom the clothing, the product of their manufacture and all other products are distributed. Nor does the decree of the Spanish Córtes of September 13th, 1813, on the transfer of the spiritual and temporal affairs of the missions make any difference, even though it were incorporated in the collection of its laws by the Mexican Congress. If in the nineteen years that have elapsed no executive power has directed us to put it into effect, it is an evident sign of the untimeliness of the law as to the letter and its construction. Yet let us be commanded,[6] and it will be seen that we obey. I declare we shall obey in so far as the transfer of the spiritual and temporal affairs of the missions is concerned. We shall deliver them to whomsoever is pointed out to us; but with regard to that which the proposed law adds, *'that the missionaries shall serve as parish priests or shall be curates'* (even if it be without the honor of a salary), 'and the rest, or unoccupied missionaries, shall proceed to the mountains in order to spread the Gospel,' after praising God for the great zeal which, as is known, consumes the authors[7] of the proposed law, we are free to put a little pepper and salt into this dish in favor of those of us, at least, who have passed twenty and thirty years in the missions, and who now find ourselves old and infirm. It is this: we have a law issued by the Roman Pontiff, approved by the Spanish and Mexican authorities, and which forms a part of our monastic regulations. In virtue of this Pontifical law we may retire to our convents.[8] In this particular, then, I believe that no

[6] By the Supreme Government which alone had authority to give such commands or make such laws.

[7] Echeandía and young Californians. Fr. Durán speaks sarcastically.

[8] The regulation was that, when the temporal affairs had been transferred to the convert Indians and the spiritual affairs to secular priests, the friars must retire to their monastery, or undertake new missions elsewhere. That meant secularizing a mission. What Echeandía proposed meant confiscation pure and simple. This the Fathers strenuously resisted, not the former.

one will show himself ready to obey any command, unless it be that the liberty which is conceded to the most wretched of the citizens does not extend to the missionaries. Concerning the laws which Echeandía adduces in favor of his plan, it appears that they in no manner favor him. He might therefore have saved himself this trouble, inasmuch as two years have passed by since his power to execute them has terminated, even if they had favored him."

Note 2. "On the words, 'The laws of the present federal system have for their basis the protection of the liberty and property, etc.'

"It is quite just that the rational liberty and the property of the citizens be protected; but this is not peculiar to the federal system alone; it belongs to every form of government. Applying this to our subject, are the neophytes in the missions forsooth not protected in their liberty and possessions? Is filial subjection, to which a weakness of character recognized by all laws that speak of Indians obliges them, and which condition is for that reason tolerated by ancient and modern governments, forsooth opposed to it? Is it opposed, I repeat, to the protection of their liberty and property? St. Paul assures us that it agrees well for *the heir to be under tutors and governors and yet be the lord of all, as long as he is a child.*[9] Such is the condition of the neophytes in the missions. They are children and sons of the family under the paternal and domestic authority of the missionary. They are incapable of appreciating complete and untimely liberty; and they are considered and must be regarded, not only in religious but also in civil matters, like those converts whom St. Paul sustained on milk because they could not digest other more nutritious and substantial food; *for they were still carnal.*[10] This, neither more nor less, is the character of our neophytes. They are carnal in body and soul and in every line. Why then, under the pretext of liberty, by regulation disapprove the very same that St. Paul

[9] Gal. iv, 1-2.

[10] I Cor. iii, 2.

observed in the case of his neophytes, and so cause nothing but *evils to themselves and the settlements?*

"Are they for this reason slaves? Since when have the terms son of the family, minor before the law, and slave become synonymous?[11] Is this perhaps some kind of philosophical discovery? Is being under paternal authority slavery? Did any one believe that he was a slave in his father's house? If so, then let all sons emancipate themselves from their families, and let them have the power to stone their fathers, and then society will be the *picture of paradise.* The four missionaries in the southern missions[12] have made some experiments along this line. They have conceded to their neophytes a little of what is called liberty.[13] Well, according to all those who have seen them those missions are a picture of horror and confusion.[14]

"We have incontestable proof that filial subjection and slavery are not the same thing in what Echeandía himself says that *a slave who reaches the republic of Mexico by that very fact is free.* Yet, are the sons of the family there free? No, they remain filially subject until the time appointed by the father.[15] Hence, son of a family and slave are not synonymous terms; and therefore the neophytes for being sons of the family are just as little slaves."

Note 3. "On the contents of the instruction which Echeandía says was given him by the Supreme Government, 'that

---

[11] Echeandía and his bawling young adherents, and particularly Hittell in our time, declared the Mission Indians were slaves under the Fathers. Well, we shall find them slaves indeed when the Fathers have ceased control.

[12] San Diego, San Gabriel, San Luis Rey, San Juan Capistrano.

[13] Fr. Martin, as stated elsewhere, reported that since May 20th the neophytes of San Diego had managed the temporal affairs for themselves—except the wine-cellars.

[14] "Segun el contexto de todos lós que las han visto son una copia de horror y confusion." See quotation from Robinson, note 38, preceding chapter. It flatly contradicts Echeandía's boast of good effects of his experiment.

[15] Gal. iv, 2.

the old Christians should not remain dependent on the Missionary Fathers save in the character of parishioners, etc.'

"Here it may be asked, Why did he allow so many years to pass without putting said instructions into practice? By the *bando* of January 6th, 1831, which is now recalled and lauded, liberty and the property of the neophytes gained nothing, because it provided for nothing more than passing some of the neophytes from the paternal charge of the missionaries to salaried secular administrators.[16] Was that also in the instructions of the Government? If it was, why did he delay publishing it until his successor was already in the territory? Why did he not give the name and authority of the Supreme Government? If it was not in the instructions from this Government, why does he bring it out now? Inasmuch as I am a missionary, and after twenty-six years somewhat versed in the matter, if the Supreme Government should deign to consult me, which would not be the first time,[17] in view of what is transpiring and of what is pretended, I should say, with the most profound respect, if it is intended to risk an experiment for improving the condition of the neophytes, contrary to the opinion of some who believe that whatever may be ordained or arranged in their favor and for their advancement seems to turn to their greater injury and prejudice, among whom is even the Ven. Gregorio López, who, on being questioned and consulted for the benefit of this poor people, always replied *'Dejállos,' 'Let them alone'*: so in our case I should say that my opinion is to try the experiment of emancipation and the distribution of lands and property, not in all the missions at once, but only in four or six of the oldest,[18] in which all or nearly all the

[16] unmindful of what the neophytes might have to say. It will be observed throughout that the wishes of the neophytes were not consulted, otherwise the missions would never have been confiscated.

[17] See chapter ii, this section.

[18] The offer demonstrates that, if the Californians with their master Echeandía had been sincere in their protestations of only de-

neophytes were born and opened their eyes.[19] In this manner no danger would be incurred, at least not so much, that they would fall back into paganism and thus undo the work of so many years. This would serve as an incentive for the other missions, and the (territorial) government would have a practical and infallible lesson which it could utilize in the north and be sure of its future ordinances better than by means of all the artificial beauty of theories. To do this, however, in all the missions at once, without taking into consideration that most of the neophytes in some of them were born and opened their eyes in heathenism, in truth, to this proposition I would reply to the gang of political prophets in the words of the Ven. Gregorio López, *'Dejállos,' 'Let them alone.'*"

Note 4. "On the words addressed to the missionaries of the four southern missions personally, 'that they ought to be engaged in spiritual things like parish priests, but in temporal affairs they should assist Echeandía in effecting the changes, etc.'

"To begin with spiritual things, it is to be observed that, according to the doctrine of the Most Rev. Montenegro (L. tr. 1, sect. 14), the obligations of a parish priest are very different from those of one who is not a parish priest. The former must serve under the title of justice; but a priest not a curate, such as we missionaries, has no such obligation, because we serve under the title of charity without salary or emoluments. As there are no curates canon-

---

siring the benefit of the Indians, they could have agreed with Fr. Durán on some feasible plan, subject to approval of the government as well as of the Indians concerned.

[19] This would have meant an experiment along the lines proposed by the law of September 13th, 1813: secularization as practiced by the Spanish Government in the Indian missions of Mexico. It left the property entirely in the hands of the Indians; but that was not what the young California freebooters desired. They wanted absolute control at a salary and the Indians as so many servants. To this Fr. Durán emphatically replied, "Dejállos," "Let them alone."

ically installed by the bishop, we are ministers only from necessity. In this sense we have not that great obligation in justice to perform what is demanded of us as would be the case if we were parish priests officially. Now I ask, which missionary could be compelled to consent to be a parish priest with conditions attached that frighten any one who has the least dread of the account which must be given? Neither the Superior could command,[20] nor the subject consent. Moreover a decree of the political authority is not sufficient to transform a missionary priest into a curate and to make the mission a parish. Not even the Mexican nation will ever sanction the so-called civil constitution of the clergy of France, which in this nation was a campaign of apostasy. There is necessary a decree of the higher ecclesiastical authority addressed to our Superiors and approved by the Supreme Government. Without this the missionary will not be a curate, nor the mission a parish, save in name.[21]

"With regard to the active assistance which this plan expressly demands, the missionaries know very well that they cannot give it, unless ordered by the Supreme Government through our Superiors. Doing so would be to subscribe to their disgrace and to so many injuries which Echeandía spreads out in his plan against them and against all missionaries in general. They would make themselves guilty and responsible before God and the world for all the damage, and this the missionaries must necessarily refuse to do. They know that they cannot and must not do more than conduct themselves *merely passive,* leaving to others what they desire, and leaving to time to tell who erred.[22] It would be charming, indeed, if the missionaries themselves actively acquiesced in an undertaking for which most injurious reasons are proposed against their persons. I do not know how Echeandía could have expected as much."

---

[20] According to the rules of the Apostolic College.

[21] The Pico crowd later decreed just this thing, but that could not alter the situation. It was beyond their jurisdiction.

[22] Time has told that those who erred were not the missionaries.

Note 5. "On the words, 'that the neophytes who have been emancipated in the missions from San Diego to Santa Barbara have applauded the measure, and have carried him (Echeandía) on their shoulders in his visits at various times, merely because he has accorded them good treatment, and procured for them the joy of liberty and the fruit of their labors.'

"There is much to be said on the applause which Echeandía received from the overgrown schoolboys. It is a very delicate matter and likely to degenerate into personalities which I shall carefully avoid; for this writing is not intended to hurt any one, but only to give an idea of things as they are in reality for the instruction of the Fathers who perhaps need it, and likewise for the information of posterity and of whomsoever may need it.[23] Nevertheless, in this note it is not possible to evade the necessity of touching this matter, and of explaining the cause of the political phenomenon, that is to say the applause and acclamations of those big children. I shall content myself, at present, with distinguishing between liberty and liberty. There is one kind which deserves the applause of great men, and there is another which merits that of big boys. I do not know from which of the two the gentleman may have received the acclamation. I can only assure him that in the first way the neophytes, like every son of a family and minor in age or before the law, which legally is the same, have been free. For the rest see Note 9, the paragraph *'Although with repugnance.'*"

Note 6. "On the words 'of the warmth with which the neophytes of the San Diego Department decided to sustain the order of Echeandía.' For this also see Note 9."

Note 7. "On the words 'that Echeandía did not want to pass from San Gabriel to the north, because he saw that the missions would be exposed to the tumultuous disorder which

[23] Posterity will be forever grateful to Fr. Durán for having exposed the machinations of Echeandía and his blind adherents.

the oppressed neophytes would create about their sufferings, etc.'

"Whether his not having proceeded from San Gabriel to the north was because he did not want to or because he could not is a matter of opinion which I shall not decide.[24] What demands attention here is the confession which the Señor makes that his going from the south to the north would expose the other missions to tumultuous disorder. How is it that tumultuous disorders in the four missions of the San Diego Department[25] have not merited from him equal consideration to those to which the missions of the north would be exposed? The truth is that Señor Echeandía shifts the fault from himself and attributes it to the vexations and sufferings of the neophytes. He makes the charges vaguely and without proof. They are already answered in this paper. It is not lawful nor logical to make the odium fall upon the slavery which he desires to fasten upon the condition of the Indians. Here it might well be asked: Is it possible that the condition of the neophytes cannot be improved without these tumultuous disorders which are so openly confessed? This is indeed hitting the gang of political prophets and making them confess to the necessity of the *'Let them alone.'*"

Note 8. "On the assertion 'that the neophytes of San Diego have tumultuously clamored that they did not want the missionaries to rule them nor administer their temporalities.'

"Here it will be well to search juridically and to ask the neophytes what the Lord asked Pilate: *'Sayest thou this of thyself or have others spoken it to thee of me?'*"[26]

---

[24] Fr. Durán might have quoted the fable of the fox and the grapes. Echeandía dared not go farther north from fear of Zamorano. It was less dangerous to vex the helpless missionaries in the south. Persecutors of religious the world over are usually just as brave in danger.

[25] This military department comprised the southern missions.

[26] John xviii, 34.

Note 9. "On the words of the Plan 'that there are continuous complaints, now from the Fathers then from the mayordomos that the neophytes haughtily refuse to work, and are insubordinate, etc.'

"In truth, it calls forth surprise that Echeandía makes such a public confession of all these disorders. Who then would not say: If the liberty which has been granted in the four missions of my department has this effect, it will be necessary to take it away and return the Indians to school as before? but no; in order not to have to confess that necessity, other causes are broached arbitrarily, for example, *'That they do not enjoy all the fruits of the labor which they perform'* outside the exigencies of the presidio, which, as has been said, amounts to more than one million dollars in the last twenty-two years. (I acknowledge I do not know the exact amount.) Who then enjoys these (unpaid) fruits of their labor? *'That they are not given the necessary clothing for themselves and their families.'* To whom then is given what is in the warehouses? Why is this not stated? Yes, why must a point be made of such vague, general, and unfounded propositions of deeds without proofs in order to have a pretext for unjustified changes by inferior authorities,[27] so that sensible people might regard them as heralds of peace and tranquillity in California? *'That silver money and drafts are reserved exclusively for the knowledge of the missionary.'* Well, no one, not even competent authority, such as the Supreme Government, has commanded the contrary! Let it give command, and it will be obeyed without hesitation or fear, for such is the obedience with which our honored office inspires us.[28] *'That the neophytes labor for the Father and for such persons whom they want to favor.'* If Señor Echeandía had said that the missionary Father is the one who toils for the Indians without obtaining more

[27] "autoridades subalternas," that is to say, Echeandía.

[28] The management of the missions necessarily involved the acceptance and disbursements of money and drafts by the missionaries alone, as far as the mission population is concerned.

than a morsel generally badly prepared, even to ceding his stipends to them to which the neophytes never had even a shadow of right, as also the alms for holy Masses, and that a time may come in which this will prove a serious drawback to the missionaries according to the scheme now being concocted against them; if the Señor had said all this (which he well knows), he would have spoken more truthfully than he did. The missionary is a single person who needs little and who is content with little. He has no other brothers, children, or relatives than the neophytes.[29] Even that which is placed on the table for him, those who eat it are the neophytes, except what is consumed by guests and strangers, among some of whom it is very much the fashion to repay our hospitality badly.

"Although with repugnance, I find myself obliged to take the key that opens the doors and windows in order to expose the hidden and obscured truth along with the enormous injuries which Señor Echeandía heaps upon the honest administration of the missionary Fathers with which, I am assured, the Supreme Government is well satisfied; I must, I repeat it, tell the truth about the transaction which is public all over this territory, and from which I would abstain were it not necessary to remove the outrages heaped up against the honor of our ministry. Señor Echeandía has known how to unite and identify his position as comandante of the territory, even after it had terminated, with the indefinite liberty and the absolute emancipation of big schoolboys, that is to say the neophytes, but without providing against the most deplorable consequences which this whole territory is about to experience, the smaller of which is the ruin of the missions and of the neophytes themselves. Through an illusion, common and natural to their character as minors before the law, these neophytes have tasted and have embraced with ardor the promised liberty. They have united

[29] "El P. Misionero es una sola persona, que poco necesita y con poco se contenta. No tiene más hermanos, ni hijos, ni parientes, que los solos neófitos."

their demand of indeterminate freedom with that of maintaining the Señor in command in virtue of promises which have been made mutually, as is the common opinion in the territory. Now the Señor de Echeandía sees himself very much tangled up with those big boys. They demand that he redeem his word, inasmuch as they had given their word to sustain him in his position.[30] What will he do in this conflict of no small importance? What must he do? Despite the freedom, such as it is, and which he has bestowed upon those in his department, and half the ruin already completed by the tumultuous disorders which the missions have undergone from the insubordination and insolence exhibited by the emancipated neophytes, occasioning continuous complaints from the Fathers and mayordomos, those big boys are not contented. They want more rope. He is unable to make them more contented save by removing them from school altogether, and this he resolves to effect. In order to give his transaction a decent appearance in the eyes of the world and of the Supreme Government (which is far away, almost out of reach and occupied with other things that demand attention), and in order to put method into the reform, as he calls it, he was compelled to accumulate slanders against the well-known honor of the missionaries. Thus he put into the mouth of the neophytes that of which they of themselves would never have thought. Fortified with this material, he in the nine articles which we are dissecting, and in keeping with the taste of the deluded neophytes, fulminates the sentence of destruction. This is the key which opens and explains all the political phenomena of Señor Echeandía.

"As is the fashion, the Señor has not forgotten to shelter himself behind Religion, although its destruction may result from his action. He has observed how the *gentiles abhor Religion, because to profess it,* as he claims, *they are obliged first to pass through the humiliations of slaves.* Well, suppose they abhor it; that is not strange. The reason is that it grieves them to have to abandon their vices and bestial

[30] See note 11, chapter iv, this section.

licentiousness and savagery in which they were born. To enter into the society of Religion is a gift from God; perhaps they do not deserve to be called. As to the rest, it has already been said and proved that filial subjection and slavery are not synonymous terms and that, on the contrary, it is subjection to God in a community of rational beings.

"The most that can be said is that, owing to their natural character, they must pass through a school of apprenticeship before graduating as master Christians. Well, what of that? Before becoming a master shoemaker it is necessary to be an apprentice for some years; and to become a master Christian, which is much more difficult, there should forsooth be no apprenticeship? This apprenticeship it should forsooth be possible to attain without keeping the apprentices together under the eyes of the missionary? Forsooth it could be possible to have them together if there is no one to give them food and clothing? Forsooth all that would be at hand, even if they do not work under his directions? Furthermore it is demanded that those who are baptized should immediately return to their haunts! Are they then really men who had already been civilized enough in their pagan state, and under government and laws, that they should be able at once, without risk of falling back into paganism and barbarity, to appreciate the fullness of the enjoyment of civilized men and Christians? The supreme authorities, whether ancient or modern,[31] who have consented to this apprenticeship of the California Indians, certainly have not been of this opinion. Nevertheless, this apprenticeship need not last always, *but only until the time appointed by the father* who is the Supreme Government alone. May the hour when it is ordered be the right one; but a subordinate authority[32] not empowered for that purpose will always be incompetent to effect it.

"The fact alone that Señor de Echeandía misled the neophytes and put weapons into the hands of the natives,

[31] That is to say, Spanish and Mexican rulers.

[32] Such as Echeandía.

who according to his confession are five times more numerous than the white people, not counting the vast number of gentiles who are in sight, (and the two classes—Indians and whites—being such rivals that they never will cling to each other no matter what the liberal evangelists may preach), this alone (which in other times would have cost him his head) excites fear for the future, and furnishes grounds to prophesy the most gloomy and melancholy things for California. Come up, come up hither,[33] Señor, and you will see with your own eyes that one part of these melancholy ideas have already passed the stage of prophecy to that of very lamentable history. Come up and hear the lamentations of all the white people in the pueblos and ranchos which are almost on the verge of ruin by reason of the incessant robberies of horses committed by apostate Christian Indians in league with gentiles, and which robberies, according to the number given by some, from the beginning of your [34] rule till now exceed 3000 head. Come and hear the insolence with which those enemies already announce their plan to the rival class [35] that they will leave them without a horse for defense and then attack persons. Their unpunished insolence constrains us to foretell that, before many years, we shall see ourselves obliged to abandon our posts and reunite at one point for common defense.[36] If in the face of these threats the overgrown Indian boys are freed absolutely, and graduate as masters on the ground of *the rights of man*,[37] to which they have already given proofs of having served an apprenticeship, in truth the blood freezes and hairs stand

---

[33] Mission San José where Fr. Durán penned his telling Notes.

[34] Echeandía's.

[35] The white people.

[36] It is certain that, if the turbulent Indians had found an able leader, the massacres which have occurred east of the Colorado would have been enacted in California. It is due to the control of the missionaries that such disasters were averted many a time.

[37] In their "Manifiestos" the young Californians with Echeandía put much stress on this refuge of rogues. The Indians were beginning to put the lessons into practice. Only a leader was wanted.

on ends at the bare thought of the eternal memory which will remain of the Señor in this unhappy land. The Señor says in his Plan, and it is a truth which our posterity will deplore, that San Diego was the cradle of California liberty, but a liberty which already has produced fruits of such bitter prospects that it ought to terrify the humane and sensitive heart of even the Señor. Much guilt is due to some of the territorial deputies who permitted the Señor to join his cause with that of the neophytes, because all being Californians they should have foreseen that thus they furnished reasons for the shedding of tears of their native land." [38]

Note 10. "On the words 'that the missionaries live engulfed in temporal affairs.'

"It is public and notorious that we have to deal with children who understand nothing but *'Padre dame,'* [39] and who on the other hand are very little friends of work to merit the gift. This is not strange, inasmuch as in their heathen state they have what is necessary without work, and they have not the artificial wants peculiar to rational society. Hence, all that now pertains to food and clothing after rational methods must emanate from the head of the missionary and the hands of his children; but these hands are so clumsy that without said head there would be nothing. Therefore, this being absorbed in temporal things is a necessary means to conserve the spiritual, and in a certain sense it is indispensable, that is to say a diligent though moderate activity, in order to procure food and clothing for these unfortunates without leaving out of sight the spiritual part: Christian Doctrine and the Sacraments.

"However, if by charging engulfment it is intended to create the impression of anything odious against the purity and honor of our state of life, then it is a vague proposi-

---

[38] It is most probable that, if Echeandía and the young Californians had obtained full control, anarchy would have reigned as in Mexico. The Americans in 1846 came none too early.

[39] "Father, give me."

tion without proof, and we immediately deny it. Perhaps Echeandía will think that the administration of these temporalities is a very savory morsel which deserves such engulfment; but he is very much mistaken. It is a charge which can be borne only for the sake of charity and out of necessity. Every step which the missionary takes, and every morsel even which he puts into his mouth, costs him a sacrifice of patience or other hardship. On the contrary, if the morsel be so savory, why does Señor Echeandía in his bando of January 6th, 1831, assign a salary (and it is not a small one) to the secular administrators who are to supplant us? This is a sign that the morsel, in the way we eat it, that is to say without salary, is not a desirable morsel of itself, but a burden of necessity. Would that we could shift it to other shoulders without risk and injury to the Indians and their property! We should fare much better.

"Now I will test the good faith with which the Señor attributes to us the being engulfed in temporalities. He knows very well that some of the Fathers, while he ruled, have asked him for their passports in order to proceed to other parts; that two have fled; that others have not done so for want of means; and that the majority for conscience's sake have staid in the belief that by their own will they cannot abandon their flock on account of the scarcity of priests. It is therefore well known to him that our eagerness to depart from the country is universal. Now I ask the good faith of Señor Echeandía to reconcile these two contradictories: that we are engulfed in the administration of the temporalities [40] and yet want to leave the missions to go far away from them."

Fr. Durán then takes up the nine articles of Echeandía's decree one by one, and in a few short sentences points out

[40] That is to say, so much attached to the property that they were unwilling to surrender it. This, indeed, was the charge of the mission enemies including Hittell and Bancroft, the latter of whom had no excuse whatever for the senseless slander, since he had possession of this and other documents emphatically denying any claim to the temporalities.

their absurdities and injustice. As the decree was never enacted into a law, it is not necessary to quote them, but in the preceding pages we find the chief source of all the slanders published against the devoted missionaries long after the last friar had died at his post. Every honest student of mission history will regard the refutation furnished by Fr. Durán as complete. What he will marvel at is that men could be so malicious as to invent such charges against missionaries who wore out their life for the benefit of the Indians, and that too without any temporal compensation whatsoever. However, we must let the able and fearless Fr. Presidente conclude the unmasking of Echeandía and his California friends in politics. He closes with these modest words:

"It seems to me that in this document I have given some convincing proofs, I shall not say of the absurdity of what Señor De Echeandía broached; I shall not venture to say as much as that; but I only say they demonstrate that his scheme is fraught with serious difficulties and impossibilities. So it appears to me at first reading. I do not wish to engage in a prolonged dispute with the Señor. Let him do what may seem best to him. I have expressed my views, not so much for the purpose of drawing his attention to them, as for the instruction and advice of the missionary Fathers, that in no manner can they lend themselves to the cooperation which the Señor may request of them; for that would be subscribing to the ruin of the missions, and to the ignominy of all the injuries, suspicions, and distrust expressed in the Plan, which were by no means necessary if the greater welfare of the Indians alone was intended. Let Señor Echeandía, then, do what he pleases in the missions which he dominates;[41] but let him not count on the cooperation of the Fathers. It is impossible that he himself should not perceive the absurdity of such cooperation. The missionary Fathers will serve as such, and in no other capacity, until the ecclesiastical authority, in accord with the Supreme Government communicating to us through our Superiors, may see fit to

[41] The four southern missions.

make the competent change, and while they are allowed the necessary food to support life.[42] When this fails them they have the natural and divine right to shake the dust from their sandals, and to go to labor wherever food is given them." [43] Fortunately Echeandía's intrigues were cut short by the arrival of a new governor, as we shall see in the following chapter. For a little while longer, then, the missions were somewhat unmolested.

---

[42] Yet the mission despoilers claimed that these friars hoarded up wealth, and would not cede the management of the property in order to live like lords! The Rules forbade them to look beyond what was necessary to sustain life or to trouble for the morrow.

[43] "Mientras se les den los alimentos necesarios para subsistir; y en faltándoles están en el derecho natural y divino de sacudir el polvo de su calzado é irse á trabajar donde se los den." Fr. Durán "Notas á una Circular ó Bando Intimado por el Señor José M. Echeandía. Mision del Señor San José, á 12 de Diciembre de 1832." "Sta. Barb. Arch."

CHAPTER IX.

New Governor.—Zacatecan Franciscans for California.—Mutiny.—Fr. García Diego to Figueroa.—The New Governor Arrives at Monterey.—Death of Fr. José Sánchez.—Fr. Durán Complains to Figueroa.—Distribution of the Friars.—Fr. García Diego's Circular on Flogging.—Fr. Gutiérrez on the Same Subject.—Vallejo Complains of the Zacatecan Friars.—Replies of Fr. García Diego and Fr. Rúbio.—Vallejo Slanders Fr. Mercado.—The Latter Suspended.—Investigation.—Fr. Mercado Declared Innocent.—Vallejo Himself Accused.

GENERAL José Figueroa, the newly-appointed governor of Upper California, on July 17th, 1832, sailed from Acapulco for San Blas, Jalisco, in order to take aboard ten [1] Franciscan friars. They were sent by the Missionary College of Guadalupe, Zacatecas, at the request of the Mexican Government for the purpose of taking charge of missions in the northern part of California which the Fernandinos had ceded to them. These Fathers, all native Mexicans, were Francisco García Diego y Moreno, as commissary, Rafael Moreno, as presidente, Bernardino Pérez, José Maria Gutiérrez, J. M. Mercado, José Maria González Rúbio, Lorenzo Quíjas, Antonio Reál, and José Maria Reál.[2] "These friars," says Forbes,[3] "were for some time detained at Tepíc, a town near San Blas, waiting for a vessel, where I had an opportunity of seeing them. They were fresh from a convent of Zacatecas, where the rules were very strict. They all wore a habit of the coarsest grey [4] woolen cloth, their crown shaven, and san-

[1] Forbes, "California," 138, and Robinson, "Life," 147, followed by Hittell, speak of eleven friars, which is an error.

[2] Sotomayor, "Colegio de Guadalupe," 273; 515; 523; Records of the missions from San Miguel north.

[3] "California," 138-139.

[4] This color prevailed all over the Spanish-speaking countries. Some in Mexico wore a bluish habit, wherefore they were called Los Frailes Azules. The regulation color, since Pope Leo XIII., is brown.

dals on their feet. . . . It was impossible not to feel respect for their character, and a degree of veneration mixed with pity on thinking on their destiny and observing their very pious, humble and meek demeanor."

From San Blas the ship, the *Catalina,* sailed for Cape San Lucas, where it arrived at the end of July. Here a portion of Figueroa's troops revolted and declared for the demagogue Santa Ana, who was then up in arms against the Bustamante government. Taking possession of the vessel and leaving Figueroa with the missionaries on shore, they compelled the captain to steer for San Blas. On the way the rebels looted the military money chest and stores intended for California, and then gave themselves up to riot and dissipation. After obtaining a number of fresh recruits the captain returned to the cape where Figueroa was awaiting them.[5] In the meantime the friars determined to travel through the peninsula by land. They soon discovered that this was not an easy task. They had proceeded no farther than Mission San José del Cabo, when Fr. García Diego addressed the following letter to Governor Figueroa. It explains itself.

"General,—The extreme necessity in which we find ourselves compels me to take the pen in order to supplicate Your Honor to have the goodness to give me a certificate of the wretched and dismal situation in which I am with my religious. The Supreme Government allowed each one of us $200 for traveling expenses. This was received at Zacatecas. With it we have scarcely covered the cost of provisions and servants as far as Tepíc. In that city we were delayed a little more than two months for want of a ship. The object of our privations, which is to reach the missions, I believe will not be attained either by sea or by land. Not in the first way for want of a vessel and means to pay our passage in case we travel in that manner; nor by land, because, although (as is well known to Your Honor) we had decided to travel up the country, it was through ignorance of the difficulties.

[5] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Benicia, lxxxviii, 60; Forbes, 139-142; Robinson, 147-148; Bancroft, iii, 236-238; Hittell, ii, 163-164.

The distance by land is four hundred and fifty-six leagues, an enormous distance to overcome even for those who have the means. How then ought it not to terrify poor friars without money, without provisions, without servants, and without animals? How should we not fear to make the journey through uninhabited regions with the prospect of perishing from hunger in these deserts? All this, General, may induce me to take the resolution of abandoning the undertaking and returning to my College. In order that it be clear to the Supreme Government that we have obeyed as far as we could, and even farther, and that it has not been in our power to fulfill its wishes, I desire and supplicate Your Honor to give me the certificate which I ask, inasmuch as you are aware of our sufferings. We cannot continue here any longer, because the bad climate is threatening our health. May it please etc." Fr. Francisco García Diego.[6]

It seems that Figueroa provided some means and persuaded the friars to continue the journey. A month later, however, Fr. García Diego again appealed to the general from a place which he calls Casítas. He complained that they were running short of funds because they were obliged to pay twelve reales a day for the use of each mule.[7] What the trouble was we can conjecture from what followed.

Figueroa from the Puerto de la Paz had meanwhile, September 24th, reported his plight to the government representative at Guaymas. "I have again," he writes, "collected the scattered troops to the number of thirty men, one aid-de-camp, two captains, two lieutenants, one surgeon, two treasury officials, and ten religious, all without provisions and

[6] Fr. García to Figueroa, September 5th, 1832. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2106. The letter demonstrates that these Mexican friars were not enthusiastic volunteers, but that they only yielded to pressure from the Mexican Government.

[7] The Mexicans in Lower California, it seems, tried to make all they could out of the necessities of the poor friars. The instance stands not alone. Fr. García to Figueroa, October 6th, 1832. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2107.

without any means whatever."[8] Evidently the governor had recalled the friars. With them and the troops he then took the ship at La Paz about the end of November, or the forepart of December, for we have no details of the embarkation or the voyage. Certain it is that Figueroa with his retinue and the missionaries landed at Monterey Tuesday, January 15th, 1833. The Zacatecans were heartily welcomed by Fr. Abella of San Carlos, and on the following Sunday, January 20th, by direction of the new governor a Solemn High Mass was offered up in thanksgiving for his safe arrival. Particulars of this incident are also wanting in the various archives.

On the 19th Figueroa officially announced his appointment to the offices of governor and military inspector-general of California to Fr. Presidente Durán. At the same time, in compliance with orders from the Mexican Government, he requested both Fathers Durán and García Diego to use their influence over the inhabitants so that they might again take up an orderly life, which goes to show that he expected some resistance. They were also to inform the people that past errors were pardoned. Enclosing the general amnesty granted by the Supreme Government, Figueroa concluded his communication thus: "I beg and charge Your Reverences to have the amnesty and the proclamation which accompanies it read on some festival day after holy Mass, so that the people may be informed and may be consoled by the exhortation which Your Reverences may see fit to give them."[9]

The conciliatory tone of the letter raised the hopes of Fr.

[8] "Reuní los dispersos en numero de 30 hombres de tropa, un primer ayudante, dos capitanes, dos tenientes, un cirujano, dos empleados de Hacienda, y 10 religiosos, todos sin equipages y sin recurso alguno." Figueroa al Administrador de Guaymas, September 24th, 1832. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Benicia, Custom House i, 35.

[9] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. iii, 257-259; Hittell, ii, 168; Bancroft, iii, 240. Figueroa, January 18th, also notified Echeandía that he had come as governor and comandante militar. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. iii, 251-252. This left the arch-plotter without an occupation and without an excuse for tarrying in California.

GOVERNOR JOSÉ FIGUEROA AND THE ZACATECAN FRANCISCANS LAND AT MONTEREY, JANUARY 15th, 1833.

Durán that perchance the trials of the missionaries and of their wards might have an end, and that the work of soul-saving and civilizing would be promoted. At all events, it called forth a lengthy reply of which we reproduce the following extract. "I believe and declare," the Fr. Presidente wrote, "that with Your Honor has come to us a generous protector, who will dry our tears which with so much bitterness we have shed in the days of our affliction, and that you will be the staff and support of our old age, whilst years and labors lead us to the grave. I place the greatest hope in the government of Your Honor. . . ." The Fr. Presidente by this time must have already received a visit from Fr. García Diego at Mission San José; for he closes the letter with this flattering remark: "In our Rev. Fr. Comisario-Prefecto I have found a wise man, a religious and a friend." [10] Fr. Ánzar from distant San Luis Rey also congratulated Figueroa on his safe arrival.[11] From other Fathers no letters are extant, but Fr. Durán doubtless expressed the sentiments of them all. Alas! that such fond hopes should have failed of realization!

Probably by the same ship that brought the new governor came sad news from the College of San Fernando. Fr. Durán communicated them to the friars belonging to his jurisdiction [12] under date of January 23rd. "My esteemed and Rev. Fathers," he writes from Mission San José, "the Lord give you peace! [13] From the enclosed letters [14] you

[10] "Considero y confieso que con V. S. nos ha venido un generoso protector, que enjugará nuestras lagrimas, que con tanta amargura hemos derramado en los dias de nuestra afliccion, y que será el baculo y apoyo de nuestra senectud, mientras los años y los trabajos nos conducen al sepulcro. Formo las mayores esperanzas del gobierno de V. S. He hallado en N. R. P. Comisario-Prefecto un Sábio, un religioso y un amigo." Fr. Durán to Figueroa, February 5th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2121.

[11] Fr. Ánzar to Figueroa, January 31st, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2117.

[12] Besides Fr. Durán, nineteen Fernandinos still survived.

[13] "Dominus det vobis pacem!" St. Francis's customary greeting.

[14] None of these has been discovered thus far.

will at once notice the anxious voice of our College, which is in a dying condition, and the hopes it has placed in us that we come to help continue its existence by means of some who may be spared after the surrender of the northern missions is effected. As far as I am concerned, no time will be lost in this matter, and therefore I have written to the Rev. Fr. Commissary Prefect of Zacatecas [15] that he might immediately begin to select his religious, so that they may gradually learn the routine and the management of the missions, and that with the help of God we shall forthwith agree as to the best and quickest way of making the transfer. I say that you will observe from the letters which I transmit to you the yearning voice of our beloved Fathers of the College so that those of you, who are able, may go to succor them in their sad solitude while they are dwindling away; for without doubt it would be a breach of charity, and perhaps against Religion also, if after this there should remain the least trace of bias or distrust of the well-known charity of those our venerable brethren.[16]

"With much confusion I confess that on this point [17] I feel some weakness, which I acknowledge publicly, as I am doing now to Your Reverences, but it is owing to the tyranny and despotism of the newspapers, which, according to their custom and in keeping with their private interests, monopolize the control of public opinion, and falsely make the public appear infuriated against us, whereas we have so many proofs that this is a bald calumny by means of which they have endeavored to degrade the masses of the nation, which retains the best sentiments of benevolence and hospitality towards us.[18]

---

[15] Fr. García Diego. Some letters must have passed between them; unfortunately none is preserved.

[16] These friars were all Mexicans. Fr. Durán strives manfully, as was his duty, to stifle every feeling of narrow nationalism.

[17] Aversion on the ground of nationality resulting from the persecutions endured at the hands of Mexicans, as he points out.

[18] "Yellow" editors as well as unscrupulous political demagogues seem to have been in evidence then just as now.

"Under this supposition, filled with deep gratitude towards the mass of the Mexican nation, especially towards the Fathers of our College, and wishing to cooperate for their consolation as well as I am able to do, I say to Your Reverences that no one of those who survive and intend to depart from this territory may hope to obtain from me permission to proceed to any other place than to the College of San Fernando. I would bewail it all my life if I should cooperate to take away a single living stone from the mystical edifice of that house, because it would appear to me enormous ingratitude if, whereas that community has always sacrificed itself in order to assist and console the Fathers of California as far as it could,[19] we should not be mindful of repaying it with the same coin and not come to its aid in its extreme need. If any one, then, desires to return to Spain, he must not deal with me for that purpose; he will first have to go to the College if Divine Providence has prepared this lot for him. There he can weigh his intention, and take steps to carry it out if there should be any hope of accomplishing it. I am convinced, however, that such a one would have sufficient reason for regret and tears during his whole life.[20]

"I am sorry that I have not at hand from Fr. Parras a precious paragraph which is to the point; but I remember

[19] It was the College which from 1767 to this date had trained and sent all the missionaries to California without receiving any compensation from either the government or the missions. More than that, the exhausted friars returning from the missions penniless in every case were maintained at the College. All that the College ever received from its subjects in the missions was that sometimes it was allowed to retain donations made for holy Masses to the Fathers personally. As a rule, even this went into the Indian mission fund of the respective missionary. Thus the College was indeed the greatest benefactor of the California missions and the most unselfish one. All the stories to the contrary from the arch-prevaricator Mariano Vallejo are fabrications. The College now had a right to expect that some of the men it had trained, when substitutes were found, should return and prevent its extinction.

[20] He would meet with disappointment in his mother country, as Fr. Durán now tries to show.

that he closes the subject by telling the prelates that they need never scruple to refuse permission to any religious, who, after spending several years in America, wants to return to Spain.[21] However, I cannot help copying a paragraph from a letter of Don Antonio Cot, who writes from Lima under date of June 1st, 1832, as follows: 'The day before yesterday I received a letter from Fr. Luis Martínez dated Madrid, October 8th, 1831. He relates to me that from Genoa he passed over the sea to Barcelona, and that he continued his journey to Madrid by way of Valencia. He says that he cannot accustom himself either to the climate, *language or manners*, and that he finds it very strange to be lacking the *satisfaction of conversing with his friends*. He adds in the end that he does not know Madrid; that, after a man has spent thirty years in America, *he should never think of returning to Europe*.' [22]

"The other ardent wish you find expressed in the appeal is that some Indian boys should be induced to go to Mexico for the purposes pointed out.[23] I believe that in time it will be very wise to exhort the parents of white children [24] to think of sending their boys to be educated at some college; I mean well-bred and talented boys, of course; but they should first consult the College of San Fernando, and for the transportation the Supreme Government. I expect to send immediately four boys of this mission with the Fathers who may have to depart. I hope that some of Your Rev-

[21] It is paragraph 568, tom. ii, p. 171, of the "Gobierno de Los Regulares," Madrid, 1783. "Que jamás formen escrúpulo de haber negado la licencia á un religioso, que quiere volverse de las Provincias de Indias. Yo he visto derramar á muchos de ellos irremediables lágrimas, y lo mismo ha de succeder á cuantos vengan hasta el dia del Juicio."

[22] Fr. Martínez could not blame himself; he had not gone from choice.

[23] Higher education.

[24] There was no question about Indian boys who Fr. Durán knew, though in Mexico they seemed not yet to know, were unsuitable for the time being. The Indians in Mexico differed entirely from the Californians.

erences, especially Fr. Buenaventura Fortuni and Fr. Tomás Esténaga, may be animated to do the same with some boys from San Francisco Solano and San Rafael, in order to give this solid proof that we are sensible of everything that affords founded hopes for the common welfare.

"Finally, with regard to the agreement for twenty holy Masses for those ex-California religious who may die at the College after having completed twenty years of service in these missions, as proposed in the letters, I immediately assent, and expressly include Fr. Peiri; but in nowise do I oblige myself in favor of those who may return to Spain of their own free will, though I do not wish to say this of the Rev. Fr. Luis Martínez on account of the circumstances under which, as we all know, he departed,[25] and for whom I promise to apply the twenty holy Masses if he dies before me. Mission San José, January 23rd, 1833. Fr. N. Durán." [26] In a postscript, at 8 p. m., Fr. Durán says: "Just as this was about to leave on the mission boat for Mission San Francisco Solano,[27] I received the very sad news of the death of our most beloved Rev. Fr. Ex-Presidente José Sánchez.[28] Two have thus died this year,[29] who, although they were not youths, gave promise of many more years of service. These two suffered many afflictions, which through the permission of God shortened their lives. Those who caused these afflictions still live. They are growing fat and are triumphing for having escaped human justice. May they likewise escape Divine Justice; but let them first think of a Christian repentance, otherwise they may well tremble; for the more slow in coming, the more terrible will be the punishment. I know very well what I am saying on account of the information

[25] He was unlawfully banished, as we know.

[26] "Santa Barbara Archives."

[27] From there the circular began its journey through the missions to be transcribed and signed by the respective missionary.

[28] He passed away at San Gabriel on January 15th of a broken heart, it was said, at sight of the evils Echeandía and his gang brought upon the Indian neophytes.

[29] The other was Fr. Juan Amorós of San Rafael July 14th, 1832.

received from the venerable deceased themselves. May they enjoy the vision of God. As for ourselves, my most beloved Fathers, let us think more of death than of life. Farewell."[80]

The transfer of the respective missions, according to the records, was effected as follows:

San Francisco Solano. Fr. Buenaventura Fortuni retired to San Luis Rey, and Fr. José de Jesus Maria Gutiérrez took his place.

San Rafael. Fr. Tomás Eleutério Esténaga removed to San Gabriel; Fr. Jesus Maria Vásquez del Mercado succeeded him.

San Francisco de Asis. Fr. Esténaga, who also had attended this mission, was replaced by Fr. José Lorenzo de la Concepcion Quíjas.

San José Mission. Fr. Narciso Durán, the presidente and vice-comisario of the Fernandinos, took up his quarters at Santa Barbara, where Fr. Antonio Jimeno, however, retained charge. Fr. José Maria de Jesus González Rúbio took his place.

Santa Clara. Fr. José Viader withdrew to San Juan Capistrano and thus gave way to Fr. García Diego, the comisario-prefecto of the Zacatecans, with Fr. José Bernardino Pérez as secretary.

San Juan Bautista. Fr. Felipe Arroyo de la Cuesta went to San Miguel, and Fr. Juan Moreno retired to Purisima Concepcion. Fr. Antonio Anzar then took charge.

Santa Cruz. Fr. José Joaquín Jimeno was transferred to Santa Inés, whereupon Fr. Antonio Suárez del Real became resident missionary.

San Carlos. Fr. Ramón Abella was stationed at San Luis Obispo, and Fr. Rafael de Jesus Moreno, the presidente of the Zacatecans, took his place.

In assigning his subjects to the different missions, Fr. García Diego on February 13th, 1833, made the following

[80] "Sta. Barb. Arch." ut supra note 26. All the Fathers in signing the circular expressed their assent to Fr. Durán's views.

statement: "Inasmuch as the Supreme Government of the Mexican republic has intrusted to our College some of the missions of Upper California, which hitherto the worthy sons of the College of San Fernando have administered with such honor; and it having been agreed between the venerable discretories of both Colleges that there should be delivered to us the missions of the north, as appears from orders which I have shown to the Very Rev. Father Presidente Fr. Narciso Durán, therefore, etc."

Having heard of the agreement made between the Fernandinos and Dominicans obliging each missionary to celebrate twenty holy Masses for the repose of the soul of any Father who died in the missions, Fr. García Diego in a circular proposed that his brethren form a like union with both the Fernandinos and Dominicans. This, he explained, would result in four hundred and twenty holy Masses for each one who died at his post. He called for an expression of opinion on the part of the Zacatecanos. The plan was probably adopted, though there is no reference to it in the records.[31]

Though, including Fr. Antonio Anzar, who had come to California earlier, but now joined his brethren in the north, there were ten Zacatecan friars in the territory, they would not accept more than the eight missions just enumerated. "I have received an order from my College," Fr. Durán writes to Governor Figueroa more than a year after their arrival, "to transfer ten missions to the Rev. Brethren of Zacatecas, but they would not take more than eight.[32] It seems to me that the hour has arrived for Your Honor to act as mediator, so that they may accept the missions of Soledad and San Antonio; for they have three religious who might serve them without causing a vacancy anywhere.[33] 1

[31] Fr. García Diego, "Circular," June 12th & July 4th, 1833. "Libro de Patentes de la Mision de San José." See vol. i, p. 482.

[32] "Yo recibí orden de mi Colegio de entregar diez misiones á los RR. Hermanos Zacatecanos, y no han querido recibir, sino ocho."

[33] In that case there must have been eleven Zacatecanos in the territory. We have discovered no trace of this eleventh friar. See note 8.

say nothing to our friend the Rev. Comisario,[34] because I have done so many times, but he takes no action. Not only, it seems to me, ought the Guadalupe Brethren prepare to accept the missions mentioned, but others as well.[35] Then some of the Fernandinos could retire; for they have had their permit for years." [36] Governor Figueroa probably did use his influence; for we find that Fr. Mercado occasionally baptized at Soledad [37] from September 16th, and at San Antonio regularly from December 9th, 1834.[38]

The Zacatecan friars soon discovered that their lines had not fallen in pleasant places. Their inexperience, a certain degree of prejudice felt by the neophytes as well as the Californians, and other difficulties caused no little vexation. The worst trouble arose from the now almost unmanageable character of the Indians, many of whom had not been slow to grasp the meaning of Echeandía's machinations. Nevertheless the new missionaries, as well as the Fernandinos at the southern missions, were expected to furnish supplies to the soldiery at the presidios just as they had done for twenty years, without receiving any other payment for the goods delivered than worthless drafts on Mexico. Some of the missionaries found themselves compelled to permit the mayordomos to use the lash in order to make the Indians feel that, even if Echeandía and his pupils had proclaimed the neophytes free, this could not deliver them from the necessity of work. Mariano Vallejo, who as we shall see was the loudest in complaining that his troops received no supplies from the missions, was also the loudest in accusing the new

---

[34] Fr. García Diego of the Zacatecans.

[35] The Spanish Fathers, also called Fernandinos, were eager to leave the territory, Vallejo and his clique to the contrary notwithstanding. They only waited for substitutes.

[36] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, Santa Barbara, July 22nd, 1834. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2182.

[37] The venerable Fr. Sarriá refused to leave the few Indians surviving, though through infirmity scarcely able to attend to their wants.

[38] Registers of Soledad and San Antonio.

missionaries for flogging the Indians. The friars thus found themselves between two fires. They must furnish the supplies demanded yet were prohibited to use the only means that would induce the Indians to perform the necessary labor, unwilling as they now were through the intrigues of the very men who made the accusations.[39]

Governor Figueroa notified Fr. García Diego that whipping was now forbidden by law.[40] This brought out a letter from the Fr. Comisario in which, referring to Vallejo's charges, he said: "The alcaldes [41] of the mission, seeing the just aversion which I have for whipping, and that when I came I commenced to abolish it, told me several times that if transgressions were not chastised as before, the mission would be ruined.[42] I replied that I had not come to change anything, and that they must perform their duty. In consequence of this they [43] as well as the mayordomo inflicted a few lashes, but only a few times because I always prevented it by means of the reasons which I gave to convince them. My mind, my ideas, my feelings are altogether opposed to this practice which I shall never approve." [44]

Fr. García Diego, moreover, issued a long circular in which he under obedience forbade the friars of his jurisdic-

---

[39] Bancroft, iii, 321-322.

[40] Bancroft, iii, 321.

[41] The alcaldes were themselves Indians, elected every year.

[42] "Los alcaldes de la mision . . . me hablaron varias veces diciéndome, que si no se seguían castigando como antes los defectos, se perdería la mision."

[43] the Indian alcaldes. It was not the Indians who objected to the whipping when deserved. They did not consider it degrading. This must not be overlooked in judging the subject. At any rate, the matter must be judged from the spirit of the times and not from the stand assumed now. The Puritans on the other side of the United States were not as merciful as to be satisfied with flogging. They straightway butchered the Indians out of existence. Criticism comes with poor grace from their descendants.

[44] "Mi génio, mis ideas, mi sensibilidad, todo junto se opone á esta costumbre, que jamás aprobaré." Fr. García to Figueroa, June 30th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2146.

tion to use the lash in punishing the neophytes. "If to correct them," he wrote, "the means of sweetness and sweet measures, which must always be preferred, are not sufficient, Your Reverences may employ another kind of chastisement from among those that are not prohibited, like the lock-up [45] and others that are not so defaming and hurtful as this one." [46] The Fr. Prefect of the Zacatecans took high ground, but the reasons adduced show that he was very much of a theorist, who had no experience with Indian missionary work, inasmuch as he held that, since the Apostles always treated the converts with gentleness, the same means would be quite sufficient to produce the same effect with the rude natives of California. The subjects in both cases were so entirely different that Fr. García must have consulted theories rather than experience and the advice of those who had been in the ministry for a generation. The venerable founder of the missions in Lower California and his Jesuit colaborers; [47] the gentle Fr. Serra and his band of compassionate friars; the tender Fr. Lasuén, and others down to the wise and sympathetic Fr. Durán, never would have introduced or continued the lash for stubborn culprits, if sweetness could have induced the lazy Californian savages to earn their living by means of labor; or if any amount of reasoning, as Fr. Diego suggested, could have made them dress decently and refrain from moral disorders. At all events, the circular was ill-advised and unkindly besides, in that without thorough examination it practically condemned the time-honored and only effective methods of the Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans. Had the Indians appealed for such a change in the system of punishments, and had they been amenable to other means, or promised to profit by them, we should unhesitatingly approve the circular; but the Indians themselves never complained about the rigor of corporal punishment,

[45] This was folly. The Indian courted such a measure in order to be relieved from work. He was not deprived of his meals in the lock-up. Anything else he could therefore dispense with.

[46] Fr. García, "Circular," July 4th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2147.

[47] See vol. i, pt. i, p. 138; 196; 262.

which in their eyes did not degrade any more than other penalties, until the Echeandías, the Picos, the Vallejos, etc., not from sympathy with the neophytes but out of spite for the missionaries, began to disseminate their insincere notions on equality among the natives.

A letter written on the subject by one of Fr. García Diego's own friars puts the matter in such a clear light that it is given here entire. "I must say," Fr. José Gutiérrez replies from San Francisco Solano to the governor's despatch of May 13th, 1833, "that in keeping with my character my way of proceeding with the neophytes is rather too indulgent. I now see that it has brought down upon this mission



Signature of Fr. Jose Gutiérrez.

some disorders which formerly had not occurred. The Indians stay away from holy Mass. They do not come to be instructed in their Christian duties. They do not attend to their work though there is so much to be done. They run away to the mountains and stay there fifteen, nineteen, and more days without letting me know. If we do away with flogging, with what punishment does Your Honor wish these transgressions to be chastised? Will it suffice to punish them with a mere reprimand? It is plain to me that they despise this, and so it is useless, for afterwards they ridicule the Father and return to their evil habits. These results, I am sure, were not reported to Your Honor by the one who elicited your official note to which I am now replying. It is true that I do order some flogging, but very seldom and with moderation, after I have overlooked many things in the one who deserves the punishment.

"It is not the same thing to contend with uncivilized as with civilized people. Law directs the latter; reason en-

lightens them; shame curbs them; and not unfrequently the point of honor stimulates them. It is not thus, however, with those who recognize no law, whom reason does not influence, whom neither the point of honor nor shame, nor anything else holds in check, except fear. This it is which flogging effects. To this the Indians have been accustomed from the founding of the missions. As they are deficient in understanding, they comprehend as good only that which in them is not chastised, and as evil that which is prohibited under pain of said castigation.[48] Nevertheless, Your Honor on this account must not think that I desire to fill the position of flogger; that is perhaps the last in which I would take delight; but I want to make it evident to you that it does this mission in my charge no good to deprive it of said penalty, unless another is substituted. By all means, let it be moderated; and this, as far as I am aware, I have already done.

"The decree of August 17th, 1833, and the government order of August 12th, 1822, which Your Honor quotes, hold good and speak only in connection with civilized people in the towns of our Mexican Republic who possess abundant intelligence for correcting and improving themselves; but they do not concern these neophytes, who lacking the mental light in which the former abound are but just beginning to emerge from their political and religious infancy in which, as is evident, they still are.

"From all that has been said Your Honor will understand my method and my sentiments on the subject, and you will at the same time be convinced that my manner of proceeding is regulated by the compassion which animates me for these poor people upon whom I look as upon my little children, and likewise as upon Mexicans like myself.

"In conclusion, if Your Honor, after due consideration,

---

[48] "Como escasos de luces, solo aprehenden por bueno lo que no se les castiga; y por malo lo que se les prohibe mediante del dicho castigo." This was the experience of the missionaries from the beginning, and according to this fact they had to choose their methods.

should deem it advisable to abolish absolutely the whipping which has been applied as paternal correction, I am ready to obey Your Honor, but I should appreciate it the better if it came with the knowledge and command of the Rev. Comisario Prefecto." [49] What steps Figueroa took in return, is not on record. It seems the matter was dropped, and the Fathers were permitted to use their own judgment.

The furnishing of supplies to the presidios, as already indicated, was another prolific source of vexation to the new friars as it had been to the Fernandinos. "Throughout the year 1833," Bancroft relates,[50] "at frequent intervals Mariano Vallejo complained that the soldiers of his company at San Francisco were in great destitution, and that the missionaries did not furnish sufficient food for the garrison, or even for the guards. He gave many details of privations endured and of his personal efforts to obtain relief, and he expressed rather freely the belief that the Fernandinos would not have permitted the soldiers to suffer so." This shows that the Mexican Government still failed to provide for the troops in California, and that Vallejo, captious as ever, was at his old occupation of finding fault with the missionaries, no matter how sincerely they endeavored to satisfy the clamors of the soldiery ever since 1811.

Fr. García Diego, writing from Mission Santa Clara, his headquarters, in reply to Governor Figueroa's note on the subject, says: "Mariano Vallejo asked me for *manteca*, and I gave him what little there was. He would not accept it, because the vessel was opened. He wanted mutton from me, and I furnished it with pleasure. He demanded shoes, and I gave all that were on hand, four pairs. I do not know what may be the cause of such bitter complaints of Don Guadalupe.[51] I know very well that the Spanish Fathers aided the garrisons, but likewise that they never brought the things to the presidios; the latter sent for them. I feel it

[49] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Ben. ii, 142-144.

[50] "California," iii, 322.

[51] Vallejo's middle name. He was frequently so styled.

deeply that this ensign [52] sends such bad reports to Your Honor." [53] Ten days later the Fr. Comisario again wrote: "With regard to the troops, I shall furnish what aid I can, but they will see for themselves that if anything is lacking it is because the missions do not have it." [54]

Fr. González Rúbio was next pestered by the irrepressible Vallejo. The Father from Mission San José, as per receipt of Vallejo, forwarded sixty fanegas of corn, ten fanegas of horsebeans, two fanegas of lentils, two fanegas of garbanzos, half a fanega of peas, and twenty dollars' worth of soap. The supplies probably were not satisfactory, for the good Father found it necessary to tell Figueroa: "This, Sir, is the small remittance which I was able to make to the presidio of San Francisco. Let not their exaggerated declamations disturb you. There will be no lack of some one to picture a misery to Your Honor which he perhaps does not suffer; [55] but even though it be so, I am not the cause of it after I did what I could; nor does it seem to me a demerit for which with malignant pen I should be indirectly blackened." [56]

The situation closer to the headquarters of the governor, at Mission San Carlos, was even more deplorable. "Your Honor knows," Fr. Rafael Moreno writes to Figueroa, "how very few Indians this mission contains, and half of these [57] are invalids through age or from infirmity. Moreover some

---

[52] Vallejo again. Such was his rank.

[53] Fr. García to Figueroa, June 15th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2139.

[54] Fr. García to Figueroa, June 25th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2144.

[55] In three months Fr. Rúbio had already penetrated the windy Vallejo.

[56] Fr. Rúbio to Figueroa, June 22nd, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2141.

[57] Perhaps 150 souls altogether, if that many. Reports ceased with 1831.

have run away, and others, the majority, will not work even if they are chastised." [58]

"Vallejo was also prominently concerned as complainant in the troubles with Padre Mercado of San Rafael," thus Bancroft introduces the story of an outrage against another Zacatecan friar. Vallejo and his troops must have behaved themselves with little consideration, if, as he claims, the missionary called him and his men "a pack of thieves." In turn Vallejo charged the friar with falsehood, which from the lips of the ensign sounds rather awkward. It is plain that little love was lost between them, and Vallejo seems to have determined to revenge himself on the friar who dared to resist his encroachments. On November 20th, 1833, by order of Fr. Mercado it was asserted an unprovoked attack had been made on a band of friendly gentiles, twenty-one of whom were killed, many wounded and twenty captured. Vallejo reported to the governor, who on December 9th indignantly demanded that Fr. García should investigate and punish the missionary. He then sent Vallejo to liberate the captives and to pacify the savages of the district. In doing this Vallejo dilated much on the wickedness of the missionary and the goodness of the governor.[59]

Fr. Prefect García without further examination suspended Fr. Mercado, summoned him to Santa Clara, and announced his intention of sending the accused to the College for trial, which was a very hasty proceeding indeed. The accused missionary seems to have silently acquiesced, but probably suggested an investigation. At all events Fr. García despatched Fr. Bernardino Pérez and Fr. Lorenzo Quijas to San Rafael in order to ascertain the facts on the spot. The result was that the Fr. Comisario-Prefecto seven months later reported to Figueroa as follows: "Fr. Pérez called fourteen witnesses, who, after swearing to tell the truth in

[58] "otros, que son más, no quieren trabajar aunque se les castigue." Fr. Moreno to Figueroa, June 14th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2138.

[59] Bancroft, iii, 322-324.

what should be asked, declared that Fr. Mercado was innocent, and that he had taken no part whatever in the unfortunate disaster which caused the deaths in the vicinity of the mission. Having heard this I released the friar from the arrest in which I held him at this Mission of Santa Clara. I raised the suspension to celebrate holy Mass, and shall declare him worthy of continuing in the ministry." [60]



Signature of Fr. J. M. Mercado.

Thus another diatribe against priests and monks, of which Hittell is so fond, as usual, proved to have no basis.[61] What amends the prevaricator Mariano Vallejo made to his innocent victim, is not on record. He was not scrupulous on that line even in his old age, as we shall have occasion to show in time. The loud-mouthed Vallejo should himself have employed a little kindness to his own men, instead of falsely accusing devoted missionaries of cruelty; for he was held in so little esteem by his subordinates that the soldiers at the presidio of San Francisco, for instance, started a small revolt for the purpose of ridding themselves of their pom-

[60] "Declararon que dicho Padre Mercado está inocente, y no tuvo parte alguna en las desgracias de las muertes, etc. Lo cual visto por mi le quité al arresto en que lo tuve en esta Mision de Santa Clara; le levanté la suspension de celebrar, y lo declaré capaz para continuar en el ministerio, etc." Fr. García to Figueroa, June 16th, 1834. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2172.

[61] See Hittell, ii, 173-178.

pous tormenter. They accused him of ill treatment, chiefly in the matter of furnishing food and clothing. Vallejo angrily demanded the infliction of severe penalties; but a court-martial ordered by Governor Figueroa only decreed the transfer of eight men to another presidio.[62]

[62] Bancroft, iii, 248.

CHAPTER X

Changes at San Fernando College.—Fr. Durán Vice-Prefecto.—Death and Departure of Some Missionaries.—Governor Figueroa.—Echeandía's Special Pleading.—Minister Alamán Repudiates Echeandía's Decree.—Figueroa's General Instructions.—He Is not Friendly.—California Rid of Echeandía.—Figueroa's Colored Report.—His Emancipation Reglamento.—Bandini's Scheme.—Fr. Durán's Distressing Report.—Emancipated Indians Veritable Slaves.—His Second Report.—His Reflections on the Reglamento.—His Circular.—The Friars not Absolute Masters.

BEFORE we continue to clear up the dense obscurity which the Californians have succeeded in throwing around their assaults on the missions and missionaries, it will be necessary to take note of some changes at the College of San Fernando which affected the friars on the Pacific Coast. Unfortunately, personal correspondence and other documents concerning them grow more scarce as the years pass by. The disheartened and aged friars, never fond of dilating on what related to themselves, write less than ever, so that it is at times difficult to even fix the dates with certainty.

Fr. Vicente de Sarriá, who had been elected comisario-prefecto on May 24th, 1824, for a term of six years,[1] had no successor in California. In June 1830 a comisario-prefecto was, indeed, chosen in the person of Fr. Ildefonso Arreguín, but he continued to reside at the College. As his representative, or vice-comisario in the missions, Fr. Arreguín appointed Fr. Narciso Durán, probably about June 1831. It had been the intention to name Fr. Ex-Presidente José Sánchez, but, as the latter had frequently expressed his loathing for any office, the appointment went to the Fr. Presidente.[2] The news failed to reach California till early in September

[1] "Santa Barbara Archives."

[2] Fr. Arreguín to Fr. Sánchez, July 2nd, 1831. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

1832. It is from the 18th of this month that Fr. Durán signs himself *Presidente y Vice-Prefecto.*[3]

At the College of San Fernando, in the first chapter held in June 1829 under the new regulations provided by the Pope to meet the conditions inaugurated by the revolutionists of Mexico, Fr. José Maria Guzmán, ex-guardian of the College of Guadalupe, Zacatecas, was elected guardian. Three years later, June 16th, 1832, the six surviving Fathers, the Very Rev. José Maria Calderón of the Province of the Holy Gospel presiding, reelected Fr. Guzmán. The discretos or councillors chosen were Fathers José Hidalgo, Juan Amorós, Antonio Peiri, and José Viader, all but the first-named residing in California.[4] Evidently the community struggled hard to preserve the institute and organization. During his second term Fr. Guzmán visited Rome in order to press the cause of the Beatification of Fr. Antonio Margíl, Apostle of Texas and Guatemala.[5] In his absence Fr. José Hidalgo acted as presidente of the College until the next chapter which could not be convened until December 3rd, 1836. On this occasion Fr. Hidalgo was elected guardian. The discretos named were Fathers Ildefonso Arreguín, Pedro Cabot, Marcos Antonio de Victoria, and Joaquín Taboada. Fr. Cabot and Fr. Victoria lived in California.[6] In 1837 Fr. Guzmán returned from Europe and the Holy Land, and on July 18th, 1840, became guardian of the College of Guadalupe, Zacatecas.[7]

During the forepart of the decade Fr. Durán fortunately continued at the head of the San Fernando missionaries. He was the man most capable to cope with the difficulties which now approached thick and fast. The office of comisario-

---

[3] "Santa Barbara Archives."

[4] Tabula Capituli, June 16th, 1832. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[5] Fr. Arreguín to Fr. Durán, October 8th, 1837. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[6] Tabula Capituli, December 3rd, 1836. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Both Fathers died in that same year.

[7] Sotomayor, "Historia del Colegio de Guadalupe," p. 644.

prefecto was revived, probably at the chapter of 1836, and Fr. Durán appointed to fill the position. At all events, we find that Fr. Arreguín on October 8th, 1837, addresses him as such in reply to questions concerning the duties of a prefecto.[8]

Two missionaries by dying at this period passed beyond the reach of grasping politicians and military chicanery. Fr. Luis Gil y Taboada died at Mission San Luis Obispo on December 15th, 1833; and Fr. F. X. Uría of San Buenaventura followed him at Santa Barbara on November 5th, 1834.[9] The ranks of the Fernandinos were further weakened by the departure of Fr. José Viader. Ill health and the inevitable ruin of the missions staring in his face determined him to retire to the College with the approbation of Fr. Durán.[10] He was the only one besides Fr. Juan Cabot [11] who availed himself of the invitation to go to the assistance of the dying College. The others, fifteen in all, died at their post; but this is a matter pertaining to the local record.

Returning to the new governor, we find that when José Figueroa in January, 1833, landed at Monterey, he expected to encounter difficulties in obtaining possession of the government; but Captain Agustín Zamorano, who had been recognized as the legitimate temporary ruler from San Fernando to Sonoma, that is to say, by three out of the four presidial districts, promptly yielded to the regular appointee. Unlike Echeandía and his young Californian adherents, the captain had given satisfaction to the missionaries, as well as to the Spaniards and numerous English and American residents. At Monterey the foreigners had actually organized a volunteer military company in order to sustain Zamorano against the revolters headed by Pico and Echeandía. Figueroa showed

---

[8] Fr. Arreguín to Fr. Durán, October 8th, 1837. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[9] Death Registers of Missions San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara.

[10] Fr. Viader to Figueroa, July 9th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2149.

[11] He retired in 1835.

his appreciation for the loyalty manifested to Governor Victoria by choosing Zamorano for his secretary. He, moreover, forwarded a full account of the revolt against Victoria tc Mexico, praised the conduct of Zamorano, Ibarra, Anastasio Carrillo, and the foreign settlers of Monterey in assisting to maintain law and order, and recommended them all to the favorable consideration of the Supreme Government. On the other hand he severely condemned the usurpation of Echeandía and his turbulent partisans.[12]

Though Echeandía in a proclamation and in personal letters professed himself pleased with the appointment of Figueroa, the latter remained suspicious of the ex-governor's sincerity; yet, in order to appease all enemies, the governor not only replied to Echeandía's letters in the most kindly terms, but also sent him as well as Pico and the other rebels copies of the amnesty granted by the Mexican Government. Those worthies pretended not to need an amnesty, and the ex-governor hotly defended his actions, especially with regard to the missions as in keeping with the best interests of the country. The defence, despite its great length, was such a failure that Bancroft calls it "special pleading all beside the true question at issue."[13] For the present, and in order to pacify all parties, Figueroa resolved to humor the guilty ones, and so allowed their claims to pass for what they were worth. The Mexican Government, however, understood Echeandía's revolutionary tactics concerning the missions very well. Even before Figueroa reached California, he had received instructions which plainly demonstrated that the ex-governor's Plan and Decree of Secularization had been disapproved, and that Echeandía had wilfully distorted[14] the intent of the decree of the Córtes of 1813 upon which he and his abettors everlast-

---

[12] Hittell, ii, 171; Bancroft, iii, 221; 243.

[13] Echeandía, "Defensa," March 19th, 1833. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. and Col. ii, 131-166. Bancroft, iii, 243; Hittell, ii, 169-170.

[14] unless we assume that Echeandía's mind was so obtuse that he could not grasp the plain sense of the terms in the law.

ingly harped as their excuse for attacking the mission system.[15]

"The enclosed document, which I transmit to Your Honor by order of the Vice-President," [16] wrote Minister of Relations Lúcas Alamán to Figueroa, "is a copy of the bando published by Lieutenant-Colonel José Maria de Echeandía in his capacity of jefe politico of Upper California. Although its object is said to intend putting into effect the decrees of the Spanish Córtes of September 13th, 1813, relative to the missions which existed ten years, and which should immediately be surrendered to the respective bishops, it is to be noted *that Echeandía did not only not proceed in a matter so delicate in obedience to the law on the subject, but, taking a course opposite and contrary to the decree of September 13th, he established agents, of whom the law knows nothing, in order that they might interfere with the administration of the temporalities, notwithstanding that the law requires that the Indians should themselves designate those who are to manage their haciendas, and that the lands should be divided* among them.[17] This right, without consulting the Supreme Government, Echeandía in said bando has taken away in such a flagrant manner as even to determine the persons who shall possess the right, and among whom the apportionment should be made, and to allot the live-stock of cattle and sheep, by appointing an administrator in whose charge the buildings,

---

[15] Despite the evidence, Bancroft and Hittell insist that the decree of the Córtes justified the "secularization" of the missions in the manner it was planned and carried out. Alamán's letter to Figueroa must forever silence such wild assertions, and brand the perpetrators as robbers pure and simple.

[16] Acting Presidente Bustamante.

[17] "Desde luego se advierte que Echeandía no solo no ha procedido en asunto tan delicado con sujecion á la ley de la materia, sino que, tomando un rumbo opuesto y contrario que desconoce el decreto de 13 de Setiembre, establece agentes para que intervengan en la administracion de los bienes, siendo así que la ley quiere que los Indios sean los que habian de nombrar los que administren sus haciendas, y que se distribuyan los terrenos entre sí etc."

the live-stock, and all the rest mentioned in the bando should be. Besides this, he assigned the subsistence which the Mission Father is to receive; but the most remarkable thing is that he has drawn up these regulations without consulting the Supreme Government, as he was obliged to do by reason of the direct dependence in which the territory of California is; nor is there any obstacle for taking the proper steps with the bishop." The minister then ordered Figueroa to restore the missions to the position they had held before Echeandía's decree was published, in case it had to any extent been obeyed. He was nevertheless to study the question, to ascertain which missions might be in condition for secularization according to the law of 1813, and to report the most expedient plan.[18]

Figueroa received his general instructions from another Cabinet Minister, Ortíz Monasterio. They also bear date of May 17th, 1832. Article 4 of these instructions reads as follows: "It being a matter of the greatest necessity that the neophytes rise from the state of abasement to which they find themselves reduced,[19] you will cause to be distributed to such as are fitted for it such fields of the mission lands as they may be capable of cultivating, in order that they may thus become fond of labor and may go on acquiring property;[20] but there must be kept undistributed the lands necessary for the support of Divine Worship, schools, and other objects of common utility. By this means, for the mission system another may be gradually substituted more adapted to the interests of the territory, the influence of the missionaries may be lessened[21] until they retain only the spiritual administration, and thus in fact the missions may be

[18] Alamán to Figueroa, May 17th, 1832. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2154; "Cal. Arch." Missions & Colon. ii, 115-117.

[19] Ortíz here shows that he understood the situation poorly.

[20] Gálvez in Lower California had entertained the same Utopian view, but wrathfully acknowledged his error before leaving the peninsula.

[21] This was the real object of all schemers. However, the friars had no objections if the Indians suffered nothing.

secularized. Yet for all this, it is necessary to act with prudence and tact, so as to cause no discontent among the missionaries, with whom care is to be taken to preserve the greatest harmony.[22] To that end are enclosed private letters written by the vice-president to some of the most influential friars."[23] Article 5 directs that Indian youths should be selected and sent to Mexico for education in order to train them for the priesthood.[24]

From these two documents we may infer that, if the fair-minded policy of the Bustamante administration had continued in Mexico, most probably in time, to the intense relief of the friars, a secularization of the missions would have gradually taken place on the basis marked out so plainly by the decree of September 13th, 1813. The lands would have been secured to the neophytes, and this was all for which the missionaries contended; but a confiscation as contemplated by Echeandía and the covetous Californians, and as was eventually inflicted upon the Indians, would never have disgraced its authors. Unfortunately, sound and honest judgment regarding matters of Religion and justice rarely prevailed for a long period in the government circles of the so-called republic. Scarcely had Minister Alamán's communication reached its destination, when rabidly irreligious and unscrupulous elements seized control of the government, and they soon granted full power for the devastation of the mis-

---

[22] This at least showed good will on the part of the administration. If Figueroa and the Californians had been similarly disposed, and if the Californians especially had been disinterested, an understanding with the friars could have been reached, since these Fathers went more than half way to meet their enemies on conciliatory terms.

[23] Figueroa's "Instrucciones Generales."—"Cal. Arch.," Missions & Colon. ii, 113-114. For the letters see chap. ii, this section.

[24] Ortíz evidently knew nothing about the California Indian character. It was possible to make priests of Mexican Indians, and many there became priests; but after more than a century of work among the California natives, there is little hope of succeeding on this point. It was more hopeless at Figueroa's time.

sions under the misleading and much abused term "secularization."

Figueroa's own ideas seem to have agreed with those current among irreligious Mexican politicians, who appear to have accepted as axioms the vaporings of French atheistic philosophers. We obtain a glimpse of his notions regarding the California missionaries, and Bancroft makes particular mention of the fact, from a letter which Figueroa, then governor of Sonora, wrote to Echeandía as early as March 31st, 1826. "I doubt not," he says, "that you will attend to those unfortunates (the Indians) who from necessity have to suffer all the rigor of those religious." [25] This shows whence the new governor had received his knowledge of the missionaries, and that they need not expect much consideration at his hands. The *paisano* chiefs took care that he persisted in his ideas, and the wily ex-governor, who had received orders to that effect from Mexico, could depart with the satisfaction that his schemes would sooner or later be executed. He therefore sailed away in the *Catalina* for the good of the territory on May 14th, 1833. His own acts characterize the man so that we need only to note the feeling of relief on the part of the Spanish and foreign population, not to speak of the missionaries and their neophytes, as expressed in this terse judgment of Alfred Robinson: "What a scourge he had been to California! What an instigator of vice! 'Hombre de vicio,' as he was called.[26] The seeds of

---

[25] "no dudando que atenderá á esos desgraciados, que por necesidad tienen que sufrir todo el rigor de esos religioses."—"Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Benicia, Mil., lvii, 470. See Bancroft, iii, 325.

[26] Whether Echeandía was personally immoral, as was the case with his Mexican successors, except the honest Victoria, according to Bancroft, we can not say. He left his wife in Mexico when he arrived in Lower California in 1825. Bancroft, iii, 243-245. "Echeandía had great difficulty in collecting, by the aid of the Padres of San Luis Rey and San Juan Capistrano, the sum of $3000 which he needed to return to Mexico." Vallejo, Speech at the San Francisco Centennial, 1876. "Our Centennial," 119; Davis, "Sixty Years in California," 475.

dishonor sown by him will never be extirpated so long as there remains a mission to rob, or a treasury to plunder." [27]

Meanwhile, in obedience to his instructions, Figueroa prepared to investigate the situation at the missions, first in the south where Echeandía had enjoyed full sway. He started out in the latter part of June, 1833. What he saw and heard convinced him that any general measure of secularization would be ruinous, and that a change of system must be brought about very gradually. In reporting his conclusions to the Minister of Relations on July 20th, Figueroa described the neophytes as children, with a natural predilection for the customs of their ancestors and for a savage life without work. During their existence at the missions they had learned to cultivate the soil imperfectly, to practice some rude industries, and to manage horses, besides receiving a slight and superficial religious instruction.[28] They had been kept intentionally in the most abject ignorance,[29] as the missionaries had always opposed their education.[30] If freed at once from their degrading servitude [31] they would soon from proprietors become beggars, after having bartered their pos-

---

[27] "Life in California," 149.

[28] A rather sweeping and hasty judgment. Figueroa had but just started out to investigate. Then it would be interesting to know what he expected of the neophytes. We have already shown (vol. i, 99) that the Doctrina Cristiana, which the converts learned throughout Upper and Lower California, which was recited every day, and which was expounded more or less deeply every Sunday, comprised much more than modern critics know of Religion, and much more than Figueroa or his California advisers observed. The possibly superior religious knowledge possessed by them was not in evidence in their respect for the moral law. From the conduct of the mission enemies the Indians certainly could not learn what Christianity is. For this the reader may consult Bancroft's biographical sketches.

[29] A palpable calumny. It shows the animus of Figueroa.

[30] The preceding chapters abundantly prove this another calumny.

[31] Figueroa seems to have blindly relied upon Echeandía's tales. No wonder Bancroft admits that "Figueroa's views were for the most part identical with those of Echeandía."—"California," iii, 327.

sessions for liquor and gewgaws. They would then return to the wilderness and join the wild Indians in stealing cattle and horses for sale to New Mexicans and foreigners.[32]

A few days previous, July 15th, the governor nevertheless informed Fr. Presidente Durán, and on July 27th Fr. Prefect García Diego, that all qualified neophytes must be freed from missionary control, though the partition of lands at Mission San Diego would be only partial and provisional. He then requested the two Fathers to express their views on the subject of "emancipation;" but without awaiting their replies, nay, on the same day, July 15th, Figueroa issued his *Prevenciones Provisionales,* or regulations for the gradual "emancipation" of the mission Indians. They were to go into effect provisionally until approved by the legislative assembly and the Supreme Government, thus following the tactics of Neve of yore, instead of first having them discussed and approved. As will be seen, these regulations were all good enough in theory, but unsuited for the class of people whom it was pretended to benefit. It was like making a dress for an infant from the measure of a giant, and therefore rank folly. It thrust a degree of civilization upon the half-savage and childish natives which it required centuries for even our European ancestors to reach. The measure was therefore doomed to failure, even if the welfare of the neophytes had been its chief motive, which may be emphatically denied. However, let the reader judge for himself, whilst keeping in mind the character of the Indians. The substance of the twenty-four articles is accordingly reproduced as translated by Bancroft.

"1. The gefe-politico will determine the number to be emancipated in each mission, and the time at which it is to be done, appointing the comisionados deemed necessary to carry out these *Prevenciones. 2.* Those emancipated will be those who have been more than twelve years Christians, married or widowers with children, knowing how to cultivate the soil or having some trade, and having 'application to work.'

[32] Bancroft, iii, 328.

The selection is to be made by the comisionados in conjunction with the misionaries of each mission. 3. The emancipated are to remain subordinate to the respective authorities, and to the Padres of the mission who will exercise over them the functions of parish priest in all that concerns the spiritual administration. 4. The emancipated will receive seed for their first sowing, and for a year the customary mission rations; but during that time they must assist the mission during planting and harvest, and at other times as they may be summoned—not all at a time—by the missionary and the alcalde acting in concert and so arranging the tasks that neither the mission work nor that of private individuals shall suffer. 5. The comisionados in accord with the missionaries will select a fitting spot as near the coast as possible, and between the missions on the highway, where the emancipated may form a pueblo if there be a sufficient number of families. There they will be given lots of a size corresponding to the amount of land at the place, where they may build their houses so as to form streets and plaza symmetrically as provided by ancient and modern laws. Lands will likewise be assigned for *egidos*[33] of the pueblo. 6. The newly-founded pueblos—according to decree of May 23rd, 1812,—will remain for the present attached to the nearest municipality of military command, which, in accordance with laws and regulations in force and with these *Prevenciones,* will care for the police, embellishment, order, and other objects of economical government in the pueblos intrusted to their care. 7. As the emancipated cease to be minors and enter upon the enjoyment of citizens' rights, the authorities will see that they are considered on terms of equality with others in elections and hold municipal offices according to fitness and good conduct. Still in order that they may be accustomed and taught to govern according to the federal system, there are to be appointed annually from their number an alcalde, two regidores, and a sindico procurador, to be intrusted with the economical government of their pueblo,

[33] "Commons or vacant suburbs." Dwinelle, no. 14.

but to remain subject in the administration of justice, civil and criminal, to the judges of first instance and other superior tribunals. 8. They must immediately build houses in regular order on their lots, which they must enclose with fruit trees or other useful trees. 9. The missionary and comisionado will assign the best land nearest the pueblo, where there will be given to each family a field, and to the pueblo grazing lands and two *caballerias* of land for *propios*,[34] all in the name of the Mexican nation. 10. Fields to be two hundred varas square, and common grazing lands in proportion to the amount of live-stock up to two *sitios*[35] or a little more. 11. Products of the land and property of the *propios* to be applied to expense of worship, church, public buildings, schools, etc. Such property to be administered by a mayordomo, elected for four years from the emancipated and watched by the alcalde and priest, who may remove him for cause, and who are to use the product of the property for the purposes specified, with the approval of the gefe politico. Routine of annual reports and accounts. 12. The comisionado and priest to render full reports with lists, etc., of new foundations. 13. The gefe politico to give titles to lands, and license to use a mark for cattle. 14, 15. Each family to receive from the mission property two mares, two cows, two ewes, with implements, etc., but all subject to variation according to the circumstances of the mission and judgment of comisionado and priest. 16. One hundred cattle and twenty-five horses to be given for the *propios* if the mission has sufficient to do so; otherwise, what it can give. 17. Each individual will mark his animals; but for two years they are to be tended in common by persons appointed alternately by the alcalde for the purpose. For one year no animal can be killed or sold; nor afterwards all the stock of any individual. Penalty, a return to mission

[34] lands held by the corporation and rented out. Dwinelle, no. 10.

[35] The sítio varied. The sítio de ganádo mayór (for cattle) was 5000 Spanish square yards; the sítio de ganádo menór (for sheep) was reckoned at 3333 1/3 sq. yds. The sítio without qualification was understood to signify one sq. league of land. Dwinelle, no. 11.

life. 18. They will enjoy in common the use of water, grass, wood, etc., on the lands assigned for *egidos* and pasturage. 19. The land to be the property of the individual to whom it is assigned, and to his heirs; but it cannot be divided nor transferred. 20. No mortgage, lien, or mortmain title can be imposed on the land, under penalty of confiscation. 21. The emancipated must aid in the common work of the pueblo on ditches, dams, corrals, rodeos, constructing church and other public buildings. They must mark the boundaries of their fields with useful trees. 22. Land left vacant by the death of the owner without heirs reverts to the nation. 23. The emancipated who may neglect their work and stock, or dissipate them, or abandon their homes to give themselves up to vagabondage, idleness and vice, will be submitted anew to the mission by decision of the alcalde and priest, who must, however, give two previous warnings, with time to reform. 24. The authorities will attend to the exact enforcement of these regulations, and will be responsible for infractions if known and not prevented." [36]

Juan Bandini, one of the chief instigators of the revolt against Governor Victoria, was likewise big with a scheme for mission "secularization." It is especially notable for its verbosity, dearth of ideas, and an overweening conceit. A specimen is the following sentence: "The law of secularization is good, because to say that it is bad would be to oppose my principles." [37] He lays down his immature notions in twenty articles. The very first regulation discloses the aims of the author and of his fellow-conspirators: "There shall be in each mission a superintendent, who shall have a *just and economical salary paid by the mission.*" [38] Like vultures the mission enemies only waited

[36] Figueroa, "Prevenciones Provisionales para la Emancipacion de Indios Reducidos," July 15th, 1833. Bancroft, iii, 328-329. Copy of the original in the Santa Barbara Archives.

[37] "La ley de la secularizacion es buena; porque decir que es mala seria contrariar mis principios."

[38] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Missions & Colon. ii, 563-570. How this could lighten the burdens of the neophytes, is a mystery. Where

to be free to feast on the temporalities which the missionaries with their converts and amid untold hardships had created and accumulated. Thus men, who cared nothing for either the souls or the bodies of the Indians, and who could have found ample employment for their peculiar talents at their own homes, tinkered with the unselfish work of the missionaries.

Before the governor set out on his tour of investigation, Fr. Presidente Durán himself made an official visit to the missions of the south. On July 3rd he communicated his observations to Figueroa. "May God will," he wrote from San Diego, "that all the ideas relating to the welfare of those poor Indians find a happy issue, and may they contribute to their improvement, which is a matter I much doubt on account of what I have seen, and of what I have been told concerning the Indians who live at the pueblo of Los Angeles. It distressed me indeed. Inasmuch as the desires and the object of the Supreme Government are that the Indians should be proprietors and laborers, I have seen with the greatest amazement that in and about said town there are two or three hundred Indian squatters. Beyond comparison they live far more wretched and oppressed than those in the missions. There is not one who has a garden of his own, or a yoke of oxen, a horse, or a house fit for a rational being.[39] The equality with the white people, which is preached to them, consists in this that these Indians are subject tc a white comisionado, but they are the only ones who do the menial work. I saw with mine eyes on Corpus Christi Day the poor Indians sweeping the street through which the procession wended its way; and I was told they do the same for their livelihood.

---

the money was to come from after the neophytes had been "emancipated," is a deeper mystery. The friars were doing the work for nothing; but then they were men who sought not their own, therefore they must surrender their charge.

[39] These were "emancipated" Indians, and such was the result. Later observers, not friars, corroborate the sad description and give it a much darker hue.

For offences which the white people consider small, or as nothing among themselves, those Indians are *placed over a cannon and given one hundred blows on the naked body,*[41] as the Very Rev. Alexis Bachelot[42] assured me, who witnessed it on St. John's Day.[43] All in reality are *slaves,* or servants of white men who know well the manner of securing their services by binding them a whole year for an advanced trifle. This abuse the natural frailty of the Indian makes possible, because he looks not beyond the present.[44] If he wants to free himself from future servitude by flight, or in any other way, he experiences the full rigor of the law.[45]

"I have seen these things, and I have heard them from men more experienced in this particular than myself. I have, of course, asked myself, what will be the result of a general or partial division of their lands and goods, and of a partial or general emancipation of the individual? Such is my opinion, and such is the opinion of these men. Hence the benevolent ideas of the Government, with regard to the plan that the poor Indians should be proprietors and independent of white people, will never be realized, because the Indian evinces no other ambition than to possess a little more savage license, even though it involved a thousand oppressions of

---

[41] Under the regulations in the missions no more than twenty-five could be applied. Rarely even that many were inflicted. Yet we do not hear that Vallejo, or Pico, or Bandini protested against the brutality exercised at Los Angeles, and similarly elsewhere, under secular masters.

[42] Prefect Apostolic Jean Alexis Bachelot, who with Rev. Patrick Short had been banished from the Sandwich Islands through the machinations of Protestant Preachers. See Appendix I.

[43] June 24th. A holyday in the missions, like Corpus Christi Day.

[44] Hence it was charity to protect the Indian against himself as well as against white greed by placing the neophytes under the paternal care of men who looked to their welfare, and not to personal profit.

[45] Here the mission enemies would have found ample opportunity to exercise their boasted solicitude in behalf of the helpless Indian.

servitude. I have seen that the Indians of said pueblo [46] are in far worse condition than the neophytes of the missions in exchange for a little more freedom to lead vicious and irrational lives. It has seemed my duty to state these views to Your Honor, because I am told that you are formulating a regulation for emancipation. Please consider well, and examine with your own eyes, for this matter deserves the wisdom of a whole congress if success is intended." [47] Good Fr. Durán's warning came too late, for Governor Figueroa did not receive the letter until July 22nd, whereas he had published his decree on the 15th, as we have seen. Figueroa would scarcely have changed his determination, though it was a matter which concerned a whole congress, as Fr. Durán hinted. He soon learned that the consequences were bitter.

From Mission San Luis Rey, about two weeks later, Fr. Durán continued to describe the disastrous effects of Echeandía's "emancipation" ideas as put into practice at the southern establishments. "I have found Fr. V. Oliva deeply dejected," he writes; "but I see with mine own eyes the insubordination of these Indians with regard to such work as belongs to them. Half the people do not want to go to the fisheries. Yesterday half of the men, who were to take the tallow to the port, were missing. The reason for all this is the want of proper punishment. Don Pablo [48] neither works nor permits work, so that the Father is a real slave and servant of all. Said Father is afraid of the Indians, and therefore permits them to do anything. I confess that I would not have charge of the temporalities under these cir-

---

[46] Los Angeles. Fr. Durán goes far when he makes any comparison at all; but he is merely drawing the attention of the calumniators to outrages nearer their own hearths and trying to humor the conspirators.

[47] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, July 3rd, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2148.

[48] Portilla, captain of San Diego presidio, the pernicious example of whose soldiers had made the Indians worse, as Fr. Durán reported to Figueroa a month earlier, June 17th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2140.

cumstances; for the whole year round, from Indian and non-Indian it is: 'Padre, dame! Padre dame';[49] but to find the Indian not willing and no one able of forcing him to work for want of a suitable and paternal chastisement, is nothing but a state of things which is apt to consume the health and patience of a saint." Fr. Durán, furthermore, notified the governor that he had advised Fr. Vicente to



Signature of Fr. Vicente Pascual Oliva.

inform Don José Figueroa; and, if no improvement followed, to turn the management of the temporalities over to the governor.[50]

When, instead of some promise of relief from these intolerable conditions, the Fr. Presidente received Figueroa's *Prevenciones Generales* reproduced a few pages back, he deemed it useless to offer any opposition to their execution, but confined himself "to present some reflexions which," he says, "occurred to me as making this most serious matter more clear and specific," inasmuch as the governor had called for this expression of his views. He then closed his "Notes" on the various articles with this suggestion: "If after three or four years it shall be observed that the emancipated Indians depend upon wild fruits for subsistence; that they allow their live-stock to decrease; that they neglect their planting and other work in a spirit of vagabondage; or that they manifest no zeal or liking for a rational and civilized life; and if, being several times warned, they do not mend, then let them be returned to their missions."[51] That this

[49] "Father, give me! Father, give me."

[50] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, July 19th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2151.

[51] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, San Diego, July 16th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2150. See also Fr. Durán to Figueroa, August 6th, 1833, "Cal. Arch.," Dept. St. Pap., Benicia, Mem. & Rep., 146-147.

would be the outcome of Figueroa's ill-advised venture was plain to everybody. The proof could be seen at Los Angeles, San Diego, and in the missions of the south generally.

Nevertheless, Fr. Durán issued a circular to the missionaries on the subject, and accompanied it with a copy of Figueroa's Reglamento on "emancipation." He also transmitted a copy of his circular to the governor with these remarks: "I enclose the circular which accompanied the Reglamento and the documents on the emancipation of the neophytes of these missions, so that Your Honor may satisfy yourself of the good disposition of the Rev. Missionary Fathers for executing the orders promulgated by you on this subject. I beseech you to return it at your convenience, in order that there may be *for all time to come legal proof of our submission.*[52] May God grant His blessing, which is so necessary, because the ideas of the Indians and of those who are not Indians and those of the Government are very different. The latter wants the Indians to be private owners of lands and of other property; this is just. The Indians, however, want the freedom of vagabonds. The others[53] want the absolute liberation and emancipation of the neophytes without the command[54] to form civilized towns, *in order that they may avail themselves of their lands* and other property as well as of their persons. I do not see how these opposing interests can be harmonized."[55]

Fr. Durán in the first paper mentions the interesting incident that he had administered the Sacrament of Confirmation at San Luis Rey in his capacity of vice-comisario prefecto.

[52] Fr. Durán wisely accumulated many such evidences, but the mission enemies like Hittell suppressed them in order to make out a case against the friars.

[53] Fr. Durán here exposes the true inwardness of the hostility of the Californians headed by Pico, Bandini, Vallejo, and others.

[54] That is to say, without these regulations of Figueroa which in a way reserved some of the property for the Indians. These "others" later succeeded in their schemes and then did obtain the land of the Indians as well as their persons; but we are anticipating.

[55] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, San Gabriel, August 6th, 1833. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Benicia, Mem. & Rep., 146-147.

In the same communication Fr. Durán touches another matter which is in marked contrast to the assertion of the Californians and their attorney Hittell that the missionaries were absolute masters in the territory. "I have a favor to ask concerning a banished Spaniard, Pablo Sobradilla by name,[56] a person whom I do not know, save that I hear he is devoted to the exercise of virtue. He lives in the Sandwich Islands. He merely wishes to make his confession and then immediately to return.[57] Since it is quite natural that no ship captain will take him as a passenger without a pass from Your Honor, I beseech you, if it can in any way be done conveniently, and no harm will result, that you be so kind as to grant the favor to this poor man, and allow him a pass on the terms under which he desires it, that is to say, for a matter of conscience, and limiting the days during which he may stay in the territory." [58]

---

[56] He had been banished in 1829-1830, for being a Spaniard. See Bancroft, iii, 51-52; vi, 726, who spells it Sobradellas.

[57] As all Catholic priests had been driven from these islands through the bigotry of the Protestant preachers, there was no way of receiving the Sacraments save by coming to California. What Figueroa's reply was we have not been able to ascertain. See Appendix I.

[58] Fr. Durán, ut supra, note 55.

CHAPTER XI.

Failure of Figueroa's Scheme.—Vallejo Applauds the Governor.—The Reasons.—Figueroa Turns to the Two Superiors for Advice.—Reply of Fr. García Diego.—Shows Impracticability and Dangers of Secularization.—Fr. Durán's Exhaustive Statement.—Missions "Ready" under the Law.—Difficulties and Dangers.—How It Might Be Accomplished.—First to Propose Appointment of a Bishop.—Figueroa Reports Adversely.—Shows the Injustice of the Measure before the Mexican Congress.

WHILE the missionaries silently allowed the experiment ordered by the governor to take effect, convinced that it would surely result in proving the utter incapacity of the Indians for self-government, Figueroa encountered obstacles and met with no enthusiasm either with the neophytes or the California schemers headed by Pico. The latter saw in it no direct avenue to the mission lands, herds, and servants; the neophytes, ambitious only to have the property to dispose of it as they pleased, could see little that was attractive in pueblo life under authority, in a living that had to be earned, in having fields that must be tilled, and in possessing cattle that could not be bartered. Nevertheless, writes Bancroft, the governor "made an earnest effort to give the Indians the civil liberty so little prized by them, but so valuable in the eyes of Mexican theorists. He visited the southern missions in person, exhorting the assembled neophytes and explaining to them the advantages of the proffered freedom. Of one hundred and sixty families at San Diego and San Luis Rey, qualified according to the standard established, only ten could be induced to accept emancipation before Figueroa started on his return to the north. He persevered in his efforts, nevertheless, appointing captains Argüello and Portilla as comisionados. The result cannot be exactly known. Some families were emancipated at San Diego and San Luis, but not enough apparently to form a

new pueblo; though they received lands, managed their property, and became citizens." [1]

The truth is that, as Argüello reported in September, of fifty-nine heads of families at San Diego only two wished for "emancipation," unless they could have the property to do with it what they pleased. At San Luis Rey he was even less successful; for out of one hundred and eight families none desired "emancipation," though four married men were somewhat non-committal on the subject.[2] This makes it evident that, at any rate, the Indians had not been cruelly treated by the missionaries, otherwise they must have hailed the opportunity of "freeing" themselves from missionary control, particularly in this very district where Echeandía had belabored the neophytes for the last six years to disregard the Fathers. He himself had already appointed comisionados as follows: Captain Portilla at San Luis Rey; Ensign Ramírez for Mission San Diego; Ensign Rocha at San Juan Capistrano; and Ensign Valle at San Gabriel. The result was that as early as February 10th, 1832, the comisionado of San Luis Rey had to call for reenforcements to check disorders among the Indians in consequence of the distribution of lands.[3] "At San Juan Capistrano," Bancroft claims, "the experiment was tried on a larger scale. All seem to have been emancipated, and lands were assigned at the mission, which thus virtually became a pueblo in October. I find no evidence that any neophytes at all were emancipated this year north of San Juan." [4] The reason was, Figueroa had found little encouragement in the results thus far.

From one source, however, the governor did receive some encouragement, and he must have made a wry face on the occasion, considering the person who addressed him, and his own observations which he was just then reporting to the

[1] Bancroft, iii, 331.

[2] Bancroft, iii, 332.

[3] Bancroft, iii, 326.

[4] Bancroft, iii, 332.

Supreme Government. Writing to Figueroa from San Francisco, October 3rd, 1833, the spectacular Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo relieves himself of this piece of hatred for the poor friars, who had at no time given the vainglorious upstart any reason for such hostility: "Thanks be to God! The missions or their owners begin to enjoy their civil rights! When I received your letter I rejoiced exceedingly, for the beginning is made which ordinarily is the most difficult. The tyrants, the missionaries, will now see the difference there is between being free and being slaves or little more. Very much I have celebrated in my heart the freedom which liberates those people out of the clutches of the missionaries. The source of men and dollars, though late, will now run dry for those friars."[5] All who know Vallejo's history are aware that he cared naught for the welfare of the neophytes. In this instance the doughty ensign, moreover, wrote against his better knowledge; but he felt big in being able to use the infidel jargon of French and other anti-Catholic writers, somewhat after the manner of thoughtless boys in our day who have their unsophisticated minds inflamed by the lurid descriptions of the blood and thunder dime novel fabricator. Don Mariano would have made a capital leader for anti-Christian Socialism. Had he been a well instructed and honest Catholic, instead of an insufferable and unscrupulous windbag, he would have known the Eighth Commandment of God which forbids bearing false witness against any one. Then such wicked stories as were circulated about the missionaries at this period, and later in so-called histories, and which are largely, if not mostly, traceable to him, would never have disgraced the name of Mariano Vallejo. Another reason for his absurd charges is to be

[5] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Col. ii, 505-509. Vallejo unconsciously discloses what agitated the minds of the plotters against the missions: they coveted the dollars, the men to serve, the herds and the lands to lord over. For the present these were safely and economically guarded by the friars for the benefit of the owners, the Indians. Hence the senseless rage. Hence the pharisaical charges.

found in himself, in that he judged the venerable men, the latchet of whose sandals he was not worthy to loosen, after his own manner of dealing with others, particularly the Indians.[6] This will all appear in evidence as the years go by.

Figueroa had scarcely put his regulations for the "emancipation" of the neophytes into practice, when he bethought himself of the government instructions to report a plan for a general secularization of the missions. This time he deemed it wiser to take the Superiors of the missionaries into his counsel. On August 2nd, 1833, therefore, he called upon Fathers Durán and García Diego to state what missions were in condition to be secularized under the law of September 13th, 1813;[7] what objections to secularization existed; and what would be the best means to be employed.[8] This law, as we know, but must repeat so as to make the facts stand out clear, contemplated nothing more than the substitution of secular priests for the priests wearing a religious habit, and the delivery of all the lands and property to the Indians exclusive of white domination. It meant no confiscation, such as the Californians demanded and eventually enacted. Be it remembered that the Franciscans were ready at all times to yield to secular priests, and to surrender the control of the property, though accumulated by their efforts, to the lawful owners, the Indians; but they refused to cede either the neophytes or the Indian mission lands to the covetous Californians, for that would have involved a betrayed of a sacred trust.

Fr. García Diego, the comisario prefecto of the Zacatecan Fathers in the north, replied under date of September 24th

---

[6] The Santa Barbara people of his time and later would contemptuously recite:

"Quien robó
"Hasta viejo?
"Vallejo!"

Which in English means, "Who robbed until he grew old? Vallejo!"

[7] See chapter vi, section i, this volume, for the text of the law.

[8] "Archb. Arch.," no. 2154; "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Col. ii, 180-182.

in substance as follows: "All the missions in our district, save San Francisco Solano which lacks some weeks of the required ten years, are subject to secularization according to the law of 1813; but I believe that none can be secularized. When the Córtes passed this decree they were not aware of the character, vices, ignorance, frailty, and needs of these wretched natives, otherwise the legislators, two thousand leagues away, would not have enacted the law or included California. The neophytes must be treated with kindness and vigilance as though they were children. The missionary must care for their clothing, their health, food; he must instruct them, put them to work, in short be everything to them. If unhappily they should be emancipated they will go naked. It is about a month since I distributed clothing; only a few have their new clothes still. Then, who will attend them in sickness, unless the missionary takes pity on them? Even as it is, he must use force to have those without relatives treated with sympathy. Then there is the passion for gambling, for the sake of which they will not hesitate to steal. Lately I took away a horse which a neophyte had stolen and sold for twelve reales. They are moreover inclined to drunkenness, and then what excesses they commit when intoxicated! I would not write them down.

"Some would say that the alcaldes could prevent all this; but it is certain that they would not choose the best men for alcaldes. Even the alcaldes are often guilty themselves and must be punished. Can such people be allowed to go about at will and to do as they please? If entirely independent of the missions, who will induce them to attend Christian instruction, keep away from sinful diversions, accept corrections? I am sure that the missionaries would have to content themselves with celebrating holy Mass, and hearing the confessions of the few who might call. Even now they attend holy Mass but reluctantly. After all, the bishop would have to appoint pastors, as we friars cannot be parish priests. If the bishop could not supply secular priests, the missions would be abandoned and the people would suffer great damage. If the law is carried out but partially, the missions

would nevertheless be ruined, and this I say in order to be relieved of every responsibility; for the missions are communities which are conserved by the labor of those who belong to them. By them the land must be cultivated, mechanical arts fostered, and the herds guarded. If the hands are missing, all must go to ruin. After all, I must remark that this law was not executed in much older missions of Mexico, like those of Tarahumara and Sonora, probably because the Government saw what would be the result. Indeed, *a law that ceases to be useful and beneficial to the community, ceases to have binding force. This is the idea of the legislators themselves, for they do not intend that a law should be enforced when it produces harm and no good.* In my opinion the aforesaid law of September 13th, 1813, is one of these as far as the missions under my charge are concerned.

"With regard to the question as to what measures should be taken to raise these wretched people from their low condition, I have to say that the means which have been employed by the Fathers will do this in time. I would omit flogging, and would permit the neophytes to cultivate some fields for themselves."[9]

Fr. Durán's reply, like all of this friar's papers, was more exhaustive. After some preliminary remarks he set forth his ideas methodically and dispassionately as was his custom. "I shall divide this reply," he writes to the governor, "in the following manner:—1. The missions which can be secularized in conformity with the law of September 13th, 1813.—2. The obstacles, difficulties, and dangers which will be encountered.—3. The ways and means which seem to me more adequate to accomplish a general secularization happily.[10]

"With regard to the first point it may forthwith be set

[9] "Sta. Barb. Arch."—"Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Colon., ii, 191-200.

[10] It cannot be too strongly emphasized that Fr. Durán, as well as Fr. García Diego, argued only on the execution of the law of 1813, which the mission enemies wilfully distorted in order to justify their wholesale robberies of mission property. This law, even such as it was, secured the property to the Indian neophytes.

Colegio de Ntra. Sra. de Guadalupe: de ZACATECAS

down as a matter of fact that all the missions of Upper California exceed the ten years of existence demanded by the law, some by twenty, thirty, and forty years, so that, if ten years is to be the rule, all may be secularized. However, Your Honor must be convinced of the defect in this rule. It is clear that, owing to the distance of the place where the law was framed, no consideration was taken of even the topographical and geographical peculiarities of this country. It appears to me that another principle of maturity ought to be adopted, one that is less exposed to irreparable and sad mistakes, and which would not involve the loss of what has been achieved in half a century. This principle, according to which we should judge a mission ripe for secularization, should be gathered from the neophytes. It should regard the shorter or longer period since which the last pagans were received into the mission, and the greater or less aptitude noticed in them for living by themselves in a civilized manner; for it is evident that the less connection these Christian missions have with the pagans, the more must they be considered to have abandoned the vicious habits of the latter, and to have advanced in civilization; and from the greater or less inclination observed in them for work, the greater or less must their fitness to live by themselves be judged.

"Following this principle, I am of the opinion that a trial secularization could be made at the missions of San Juan Capistrano, San Buenaventura, Santa Barbara, Purisima, San Antonio, San Carlos, Santa Cruz, and San Francisco; for in all these missions it is many years since a pagan Indian was admitted. On the other hand one sees in these neophytes some interest to cultivate their little gardens, which they care for moderately well and raise some produce when conditions are favorable, as when they are given the aid of implements, animals, and other conveniences, though not without the pain of seeing them lose those articles through the vice of drink, which has spread among them horribly. These might be secularized along with the missions if a certain amount of property which they might enjoy as their own were allotted

to them. The rest of the property could be reserved in order that there might always be a fund or capital belonging to the community, and administered by themselves through mayordomos of their own choice and race, for expenses of Divine Worship, spiritual administration and others that might occur. In the beginning it would be well that the missionary have some kind of authority over said fund, but without any coercion of the mayordomos and alcaldes, because these are to bear all the responsibility before the government for the losses that may result for not appreciating the fatherly advice of the missionary. All this should be carried out with the warning to the neophytes that they will be put back to the old conditions under the missionaries, whenever it should be discovered that through sloth, preference for wild fruits, or an inclination to vagrancy or other vices, they neglect their property and frustrate the advance of civilization and agriculture which the government expects of them. At the same time, the government should see that similar results are observed in the white people, so that the natives may receive practical lessons through the eyes, which is the shortest road to progress. With these precautions the difficulties and drawbacks following the secularization of the missions may partly be overcome.

"However, as soon as the experimental secularization of the said eight missions has been decreed, two difficulties will present themselves to the government. The one is the indifferent and slothful disposition of the neophytes, the other is the necessity of supporting a hundred burdens which circumstances have rendered inevitable, namely, the maintenance of the troops who for twenty-three years have been subsisting upon the toil of the unfortunate Indians to the not little hardship and worry of the missionaries; for the latter are compelled to regard themselves as executioners, as it were, of these poor neophytes, inasmuch as they are forced to increase the amount of work to satisfy the demands of the soldiery, and also owing to the lack of consideration on the part of the military storekeepers (habilitados) in their demands and sometimes in the manner in which they make

their requests. The indolent and slothful disposition of the neophytes is surely notorious and evident, since any one can observe with what little eagerness they do all that pertains to the community, notwithstanding that they know they are working for themselves.[11] Nor is their activity much more lively and steady when working at some private task, or when they cultivate a piece of land allotted to themselves, inasmuch as for the sake of a diversion or some festivity in a neighboring mission they will abandon everything to damage from animals, and in one day with indifference allow the hopes of a whole year to be destroyed. It was only by means of the hard work and care of the missionaries that, under God, the great miracle of supporting these communities has been accomplished. It is true that their indifference and indolence is not quite so remarkable in keeping their own fields and gardens; but when they shall have to supply their own implements and tools, as will have to be the case when they become emancipated proprietors, it is much to be feared that they will not plant nor achieve much. If they evince some interest in having a garden, it is because some exemptions from community work are allowed them, and some liberty to roam about, which they would not have if they did no private planting.

"As yet the missionaries have not the pleasure of seeing their neophytes devote themselves to agriculture for love of work; for this is against their naturally wild disposition and habits, which they inherited from their pagan state, so that it costs them much to lay aside the freedom natural to wild beasts, in which condition rude nature in a manner provided the necessaries without personal labor. This is the liberty they still crave. They are barely able to appreciate that which is proper to human beings, except for the faint hope, founded or unfounded, of being able to enjoy in some degree their former liberty of roving about. The truth is, that the labor of the missionaries to make men of them is

[11] in so far as each one shares in what was stored for the benefit of all in the community warehouses. It was socialism based on Christian principles.

the most laborious in the world, because what has been said about the character of these California Indians is so common to all that there is scarcely known a single exception. For this I appeal to the testimony of all, Your Honor's included, as well as to that of all those who have come into close contact with them. Inasmuch, however, as it would not be strange that any one should think that I or the missionaries have an interest in undervaluing the Indians, and emphasizing their inaptitude and immaturity for emancipation for the reason that we find ourselves well fixed in the management of their affairs,[12] in my name as well as in the name of all the missionaries of San Fernando College I protest against such a supposition. I moreover sincerely and urgently beseech the Supreme Government and Your Honor to grant us the favor of relieving us from the burden and to place other persons in charge. We shall be satisfied to zealously attend to spiritual matters for only the necessary subsistence until other missionaries arrive to take our places.[13] I assure you, and I protest to Your Honor, that though the bando of José Maria de Echeandía of the 6th of January, 1831, provided it had been feasible and issued in good faith, was for us incomparably more advantageous than the system proposed, we nevertheless would have reason to deplore it.

"The other obstacle to secularization is the necessity for these communities to support the troops whom the government does not pay in such a manner that with their pay they can procure subsistence wherever they find it. It is now twenty-three years that these poor soldiers know nothing about their salaries. Had it not been for the communities of Indians under the management of the missionaries, there would not have been any soldiers for the internal peace and the external defense, because they would have perished from hunger. Consequently, after the missions have been

[12] Such was the venomous charge of the enemies who accused the Fathers of holding to the property and their position for that reason.

[13] Nothing could have been more generous. They had repeatedly made the same offer years before.

secularized,[14] we can no more rely on them for anything; for, if the Indians notice that they must pay taxes on their private property, they will soon manage to have nothing, will abandon everything, and go off to the wilderness and tulares in order to live on the products of nature, and there will be no possibility of forcing them from their haunts. In their opinion they will thus gain, inasmuch as they will find themselves free from necessities whose absence in their savage state they never felt. It is the place of the governor to know his resources, and whether they can support the troops independently of these communities.

"The third and last point which I have proposed to answer is to treat of the means for carrying out a universal secularization of the missions without destroying what has been planted and reared with so much labor. To arrive at this goal I find two royal roads which both lead to it. The one is simple and insures quick and happy results, but it is expensive to the government, because for some years it requires aid from the treasury. The other is a little more complicated, and its results cannot be so quick, but it involves no expense. It needs no more than to open a gate which has no bolts nor locks, and it is in the power of the governor to open it with facility.

"The first way consists in founding a new chain of missions and presidios to the east of the old missions, and leaving it to the neophytes to join the new establishments or to organize civilized pueblos on the sites of the old missions. The natives near the new missions, as is likely, will attach themselves to them, and those neophytes who remain at the old missions will form civilized pueblos. In this manner the opportunity of scattering in the wilderness and the tulares is shut off, and they would lose the hope of returning to their nomadic life, as they would either have to join the new missions or lead a rational life in the pueblos, so that insensibly, as it were, they would be bound to lead a life of virtue. This seems to me the surest way of securing

[14] after the property has been turned over to the rightful owners, the Indians.

happy results from a general secularization. Unless these exits are shut off, some think a dispersion is much to be feared without any hope of ever recovering the runaways. There would then be imminent danger for the safety of the country, especially if, some day when allied to the savages of the frontier, they should acquire firearms from foreigners in return for skins. In this there is real danger for Upper California; but as neither the treasury nor the missionaries [15] are in condition to take this road, I desist from enlarging on the proposition, and am satisfied to have pointed it out, until God grants us more favorable times.

"The other less rapid road to the end, though safe and inexpensive for the government, is to found a bishopric in Upper California alone and leaving the tithes absolutely to the administration of the bishop. With this help alone he would establish a seminary for the ecclesiastical education of the sufficiently numerous sons of decent and honorable families, who have no goal or suitable career in this limited society. There is hope that many of these might have a vocation for the sacred ministry. These alone would furnish a native and select clergy to serve the Church with honor. From this same nursery in a short time would emerge a surplus of priests for the founding of a second missionary college, of either the secular or regular clergy, and in this way alone provisions could be made for new missions and old pueblos.[16] One man can effect this, a bishop, as long as he does not come to rest, but to work, and by means of the tithes alone,[17] provided they are controlled by the Church

[15] The Fernandinos were too old and infirm; for the Zacatecans under Fr. García Diego he could not speak, of course, but they had not labored among pagans before, and were too few anyway.

[16] Fr. Durán entertained a lofty opinion of the inhabitants which unfortunately their conduct failed to confirm.

[17] The worthy Fr. Presidente trusted too much to the good will of the Californians. How much of it existed, at least among those who managed to come to the surface, can be inferred from the bluster of the Picos, Bandinis, Vallejos, etc. However, Fr. Durán enjoys the honor of having first urged the appointment of a bishop for California, premature though it was.

alone. Ecclesiastical property allowed to operate freely works wonders for the benefit of all. This is a fact which is evident, of daily experience, and proved by all nations. The Church in her organization is economical, and her hands seem to be those that multiplied the bread in the deserts. Let the governor but protect her, when it may be taken for certain that in a few years she will have her seminary for ecclesiastical education, the college for missionaries, a cathedral, the rest of the ministry in running order, and the old pueblos supplied with select laborers.[18] Then a general secularization of all the missions can be effected without the risk of scattering the newly-made Christians; then with giant strides will the natives advance in civilization; and among the white people will also be banished vagrancy which is the real pest of California society.

"These ideas which I have the honor of explaining to Your Honor in obedience to your orders have come to me during the twenty-seven years which I have spent in the service of these missions, and they are almost as old as my office of missionary. I express myself thus in proof of my impartiality, and I protest that I only aim to help as well as I can, in order that the government may be enlightened to choose with understanding among so many projects and plans which are offered to benefit California those that seem more suitable to this end, and in order that in a moment may not be destroyed what has been reared during more than half a century at the cost of so much expense and toil." [19]

---

[18] The enthusiastic Fr. Durán must have mixed very little with the Latin settlers of California who monopolized the term Californians, otherwise he could not have even dreamed of such results as he pictures to the governor.

[19] Fr. Durán, "Respuesta y Parecer," Santa Barbara, October 3rd, 1833. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Col. ii, 201-206. See also Bancroft, iii, 333-335. It is characteristic of Hittell that he suppressed the able papers of Fathers Durán and García Diego, as well as many others contained in the "California Archives." He wanted nothing commendatory of friars! The sincere historian utilizes every scrap, no matter whence it originated, in order to reach the truth.

His own observations, and the representations of Fathers Durán and García Diego, now convinced Governor Figueroa that any general measure of secularization would be productive of great injury to the interests of California. When he therefore learned that a bill for the secularization of the missions had been introduced into Congress, he hastened to lay before the Supreme Government the results of his experience in the following letter to the President of the Republic:

"In compliance with the orders communicated to me, and desirous of putting into effect the benevolent intentions of the Supreme Government concerning the secularization of the missions for the relief of afflicted humanity, I have by every means possible endeavored to acquaint myself with the state of civilization reached by the neophytes. For this purpose I have consulted with men of standing who are capable of passing an opinion on the subject, and thus collected all the facts obtainable. These I transmit for the deliberation of the Supreme Government. Meanwhile, however, the news has reached me that in Congress a project is under discussion for the total secularization of these missions, and for the distribution of their lands and property. This constrains me to despatch to Your Excellency the replies of the Rev. Fr. Narciso Durán, presidente and comisario prefecto of the missionaries of the College of San Fernando, and of the Rev. Francisco García Diego, comisario prefecto of the missionaries of the College of Guadalupe, Zacatecas. The opinion of these prelates will explain to Your Excellency the difficulties which stand in the way of the execution of said proposed law, and of the disagreeable consequences which may result therefrom.

"While not agreeing entirely with all their views, I believe that the measure for a general secularization is premature. It must be effected by degrees, partially, and with some tact. For the mission system another system adapted to the character and circumstances of our natives[20] should be

[20] As the mission system was adapted to the character and circumstances of the natives, in fact grew out of these circumstances;

substituted in a way that would hardly be noticed. Otherwise with one blow the labor of many years will be destroyed. An absolute and sudden change must of necessity cause general confusion and irreparable havoc.

"These natives, Sir, are scarcely domesticated, and very little civilized. The majority of them are still in such a savage state as if they had just emerged from the forest.[21] They are as silly as children, so that it is necessary to lead them as by the hand to civilization. Let the reforms demanded for their better civil and religious education be introduced at a seasonable moment, so that they may be able to grasp the right of possessing land; but let not with one blow the missions be destroyed. Such a remedy is worse than the evil. To think otherwise seems to me an error to repair which vain regrets will be useless.[22]

"When I informed Your Excellency that I had commenced to emancipate some of the neophytes by giving them some land and goods so that they might establish themselves, I also indicated my opinion with regard to a total secularization of the missions, which as I view the matter might be prejudicial rather than beneficial. To-day, as I reaffirm these ideas, after I have acquired more information, I have reason to persist in them and not to change my mind.[23]

"I myself have personally ordered more than sixty families at Mission San Diego and more than one hundred at Mission San Luis Rey to be registered with a view to emancipate

---

and as, according to Mr. Charles F. Lummis, no better system for the civilization of an aboriginal people has yet been discovered, it is plain that only the friars, for being friars, were the thorn in the side of the politicians; for the rest the politicians were all at sea, save those of them who coveted the mission lands.

[21] They were mentally as weak and improvident. To claim that otherwise they had not advanced would be flying into the face of truth.

[22] "Pero no se destruyan de un golpe las misiones, porque el remedio es peor que el mal. Suponerlo contrario me parece un error, y no bastarán á repararlo inutiles arrepentimientos."

[23] It would be interesting to learn what induced Figueroa to entirely reverse this sane judgment within less than a year.

them from the control of the missionaries,[24] and to found separate pueblos. I allotted lands to them with water from the mission supply itself, also live-stock and everything necessary for establishing themselves. I collected them and accompanied them to their new habitations. I explained to them the advantages they were about to acquire and the liberty they were to enjoy; yet I had the grief to hear them refuse everything for the sake of remaining in the servitude in which they had lived,[25] and no arguments were powerful enough to convince them. The result is that of them all only ten families from San Diego Mission and four from San Luis Rey remained emancipated. However, I gave orders that my regulations should be carried out in the hope that the others may change their minds; but much patience and perseverance is necessary. The said incident is the most convincing proof of their ignorance and little disposition for self-government. As there are hopes of emancipating all the neophytes of Mission San Juan Capistrano, because they appear more civilized, I shall in due time report the outcome of this measure.[26]

"In the same manner, and under certain conditions indispensable for the conservation of the land and property which are to be allotted, the eight missions proposed by Fr. Narciso Durán and some other missions might be secularized, inas-

---

[24] A high-handed proceeding. The Indians were not allowed the liberty to stay with the Fathers! A strange kind of "freedom."

[25] "Tuve el sentimiento de oirlos renunciar de todo, por permanecer en la servidumbre en que vivian." This "servitude" must have been very light, then, and the Indians must have felt contented under the care of the Fathers, verily as much as children in the care of solicitous parents. Why not leave them there? The whole reason was, the guardians wore a religious habit, cared nothing for temporal gain, and could not therefore be bribed to participate in any nefarious scheme.

[26] Through the machinations of Echeandía, as we have seen, the neophytes of San Juan had become the most unruly and dangerous. Figueroa might well bank hopes on them. Yet even these were reluctant.

much as they are about as equally advanced. Such is my opinion.

"It remains for me to make a few reflections on the proposed law touching the mission property. It commands that the property should be divided among the Indians, the troops, and the inhabitants, natives as well as foreigners. I call the attention of your Excellency to this point in order that you may bear in mind that the movable as well as the immovable property are the exclusive fruit of the labor of



Signature of Governor José Figueroa.

the neophytes. They alone sacrificed themselves for the acquisition of such property. From this property every passer-by has been succored and aided. From it in part and for many years the troops of the territory have been supported. From it the expenses for Divine Worship and its ministers are paid, churches erected, vestments purchased, and all manner of buildings are constructed. From it, in short, the inhabitants of California in various ways are maintained. Many, Sir, are the exactions made upon this mission property which belongs solely to the neophytes through whose labor it has accumulated and has been preserved.[27] It would be much to the point to find out for what reason they should be despoiled of it, or by what right it should be enjoyed by other people whom it cost nothing.[28]

---

[27] "Son muchas, Señor, las exacciones, que sufren los bienes de temporalidad propios unicamente de los neofitos por cuyo trabajo se han adquirido y conservan." It was ungenerous in Figueroa not to give credit here to the missionaries. Without them the Indians would have produced absolutely nothing.

[28] For this reason common justice demanded that the neophytes should enjoy this property. Figueroa unwittingly, perhaps, adopts

"Furthermore, I supplicate Your Excellency to bear in mind that the said law concedes to foreigners, in preference to Mexicans, the privilege of acquiring lands and rights. Whilst the soldiers, who with their blood uphold the rights of their native country, cannot make option on a piece of land unless they have a title, to the foreigners, merely for coming to live among us, lands are granted which have been redeemed and cultivated at the cost of the labor and lives of Mexicans [29] and to their detriment. This it seems to me is unjust. There are extensive tracts which need settlers. There the foreigners may obtain for cultivation the land which they lack in their own country on account of the density of population. Certain it is, too, that there are thousands of Mexicans who would occupy them and who need them, etc. All this I have the honor etc." [30]

This closing argument of Figueroa the friends of the Indians used against the covetous Mexicans and Californians. As the governor points out, there were many tracts of untilled land all over the territory. Those crying for land and more land could have had these tracts. They could have made them productive as the missionaries had made thousands of acres productive with the aid of the neophytes. That, however, meant labor and the sacrifice of ease, which was just what the Picos, Bandinis, Vallejos, etc., wanted to avoid by simply appropriating the cultivated mission lands. It was for this purpose that they untruly charged the missionaries with appropriating all the land in order to keep out settlers.

---

the position of the friars. What a pity he did not keep to it a year later! Perhaps we shall learn the reason for the change as we proceed.

[29] Mexican subjects, i. e., Indians; for the Mexicans proper, or the Californians so called, had done comparatively very little in this line.

[30] Figueroa to the President of Mexico, October 5th, 1833. "Cal. Arch.," Mis. & Col. ii, 183-190. Though addressed to the Minister of Relations, the conclusion shows that the letter was directed to the Mexican President.

CHAPTER XII.

Secularization before the Mexican Congress.—What Led to It.—Elections in California.—Juan Bandini Goes to Congress.—Legislature Meets at Monterey.—Figueroa's Pompous Address.—Proposes Plan against the Missions.—A Colonization Swindle.—Juan Bandini Joins the Schemers.—Colonists Collected.—Compañia Cosmopolitana.—Híjar and Padrés Demand Possession of the Missions.—Baffled.—Híjar's Instructions.—The Legislature Rejects His Demands.—Colony Goes to Pieces.—Bandini Disappointed.—His Smuggling Operations.—Deposed and Disgraced.

WHATEVER might have been the effect of Governor Figueroa's representation at any other time and under other circumstances, his advice came too late. "The National Congress," says Bancroft, "without waiting for the governor's report, and largely through the influence of the Híjar and Padrés party, had not only discussed a bill for secularization, but had passed it on the 17th of August, 1833." [1]

Let us turn back and look for the motive of this haste in passing a measure which opened the doors to the spoliation of the mission establishments, notwithstanding that they had proved a boon for 75,000 Indian converts, and had sustained the territorial government with all its troops for a quarter of a century. After returning from his first inspection of the southern district, where Echeandía had exercised his baneful power, Governor Figueroa on October 15th ordered primary elections to take place the first Sunday of November, 1833. The electors chosen assembled at Monterey on Sunday, December 1st, and elected as deputy to the Mexican Congress J. Bandini,[2] "who as luck would have it," Ban-

[1] Bancroft, iii, 336.

[2] The electors chosen by the town councils had on March 24th already elected Juan Bandini as deputy. The latter had left California with Echeandía soon after, and thus arrived in time to throw

croft says,[3] "was one of Padrés's northern disciples, and who lost no time in identifying himself with the new schemes" of colonizing California. The members chosen for the territorial assembly on December 2nd were Carlos Antonio Carrillo, Pio Pico, Francisco de Haro, Joaquín Ortega, José Antonio Carrillo, José Antonio Estudillo, and José Castro y Álvarez. The substitutes were Santiago Estrada, Carlos Castro and José Pérez.[4]

These newly elected members of the legislative assembly held their first meeting at the governor's house, Monterey, on May 1st, 1833. The governor presided. He opened the sessions with an address in which in high-flown language he predicted great prosperity, now that Spanish tyranny was a thing of the past. On reaching the subject of the missions he exclaimed: "Behold here one of the grandest objects entrusted to our zeal.[5] These missions, where for many years monastic despotism[6] has intrenched itself behind the twofold title of spiritual and temporal administration,

---

his influence against the missions and missionaries. Figueroa seems to have declared the election illegal. At all events he ordered new elections with the result that Bandini, the enemy of the missions, was reelected as stated above. Bancroft, iii, 246.

[3] "California," iii, 260.

[4] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Los Angeles i, 700; San José iv, 561; 574; Leg. Rec. ii, 32.

[5] Rather, Figueroa's zeal and those of his political persuasion arrogated to themselves the task of absolute control of the missions which did not concern them, as those establishments were ecclesiastical institutions for the conversion and civilization of the natives. More than that, the missions contributed most to the support of the military government of the territory.

[6] Figueroa must have known what despotism is, but to connect it with monasticism showed that he knew nothing about monastic life. Order is observed in monastic communities as in every decent society or community. Regularity, industry, and piety are features. Figueroa proved how meagre must have been the religious instruction of even the so-called educated Mexicans, otherwise he and they would have known better than to apply to the vaporings of infidels and Voltairian libertines for information about monasticism.

sternly call for a salutary reform[7] which corresponds with our present system.[8] The Supreme Government, desirous of reforming the lot of our wretched natives, committed to my predecessors the necessary authority to gradually change their condition, so that they might enjoy the advantages of our independence.[9] However, I know not through what fatality they have continued in the same way as they were at the beginning of their founding.[10] No one has carried out the instructions of the Supreme Government. Señor Echeandía, who intended to execute them, dealt with them only in a nominal manner so that, far from producing favorable results, there appeared signs of disorganization owing to the little prudence with which he impressed upon the neophytes the idea of liberty without putting it into effect. For this reason, and in order to partially relieve afflicted humanity, I have projected and put into execution a plan of emancipation, which, whilst it conciliates the various heterogeneous interests, after a few years ought to produce a political change, which will restore that portion of unfortunates to the enjoyment of their inalienable rights. In fact, three new pueblos have been formed, San Dieguito, Las Flores, and

---

[7] The only reform sternly demanded for the welfare of the Indians and the territory was that the politicians let the missions carry out the object for which they had been founded. Insubordination, drunkenness, and other white vices among the neophytes began with the interference of greedy white men who needed to reform themselves first.

[8] The mission system in its essential features has been found to be quite in keeping with the republican system of the United States; for it is continued in the Indian reservations.

[9] The neophytes would have enjoyed every advantage, including the fruits of their labor, if they had not been for the last thirty years compelled to support shiftless troops without receiving anything in return from the government, and if the missionaries and their neophytes could have breathed as freely as other people.

[10] This was manifestly untrue, as all sincere historians, the early travellers, and the United States Government reports attest. What disorder there existed at Figueroa's time was due to the interference of Echeandía and other mission enemies.

San Juan Capistrano, which all are advancing in a regular manner.[11] In a very short time a great difference is noticeable between the emancipated and the neophytes.[12] I dare predict not only their elevation to the dignity of free men, but their better preservation without the annihilation which is palpable in the missions." [13]

Figueroa's recommendations were referred to a committee. The assembly was in session until August 2nd, when it seems to have adjourned. In October and November an extra session took place.[14] The members frequently discussed the missions which, characteristic of the men who composed the assembly, seem to have not found a single champion. These would-be statesmen were therefore equally guilty in the transactions which gradually destroyed the work of the missionaries. For this reason we have taken pains to report the names accurately, and their efforts along this line will be closely followed. For the present we must leave them in order to give our attention to another matter which is intimately connected with the confiscation of the missions.

It will be remembered that José Maria Padrés, the instigator of Echeandía's "secularization" decree, and the evil spirit of the young Californians, had in 1831 been expelled by Governor Victoria. He vowed to return with full powers to carry out his designs on the Indian establishments. In Mexico he enlisted José Maria Híjar, a man of property, influence, and reputation, for his plan. To begin with, early in 1833 the two worthies devised a project for organizing a colony in California. Political changes in the so-called republic favored the plotting pair; for in April Valentín Gómez Farías, a warm personal friend of Padrés, was elected vice-president, and became acting president upon the retirement of President Santa Ana. With him a spirit altogether different from that which had prevailed under the Busta-

[11] The preceding chapter refutes this in Figueroa's own words.

[12] There was a great difference, but it favored the neophytes.

[13] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. ii, 40-41.

[14] Bancroft, iii, 248-251.

mante administration seized the government circles. Soon after a letter arrived from Governor Figueroa asking to be relieved from office on account of ill-health.[15] This was the opportunity above all which Padrés needed to accomplish his ends. Farías on July 12th, 1833, accordingly directed his friend to proceed to California and to assume the military command if Figueroa persisted in his desire to leave the territory, whose climate from the beginning had not agreed with his health. Better still, Padrés on July 15th obtained for his associate Híjar the appointment of gefe-político or civil governor of California. On the next day Híjar was, moreover, appointed director of the new colonization scheme which had just been launched by Padrés and Híjar. He was to receive a salary of $1000 in addition to that of $3000 for his services as civil governor, and he might name a secretary to receive $1,500. Padrés himself was made assistant director of colonization.[16] "The object of the latter was to get hold of the administration of the California missions; but his new plan was to do so, not as it had been before by attempting to manipulate secularization directly, but by means of a high-sounding colonization project to get close up to the management of affairs and attain the same purpose indirectly." [17]

It was about this time that there appeared on the scene to represent California in Congress, in place of Carrillo, one of Padrés's disciples, Juan Bandini, who as stated lost no time in identifying himself with the new schemes. "Largely by the influence of the combination," says Bancroft, "the law of August 17th, 1833, was passed, requiring the immediate secularization of the missions; and a supplementary decree of November 26th authorized the adoption of such measures as might be necessary to assure colonization and carry secularization into effect, using 'in the most convenient

[15] His petition was dated March 25th, only two months after his arrival.

[16] Bancroft, iii, 259-260; Hittell, ii, 190-191.

[17] Hittell, ii, 191.

manner the revenues of the Pious Fund [18] to furnish resources for the commission and the families now in this capital bound for that territory.' I may add that, besides the vice-president, the diputado from California (Bandini), the territorial gefe-político (Híjar), and the prospective comandante general, Padrés numbered among the adherents of his plan our old friends José Maria Herrera, now reappointed sub-comisario of revenues, and Ángel Ramírez, who was sent to take charge of the Monterey custom-house. Truly, the ayudante inspector's star was in the ascendant, all obstacles to the success of his schemes being apparently removed." [19]

As soon as the new appointments were announced, the projectors lost no time in commencing operations. Híjar immediately made arrangements to have a portion of his salary paid to his family, which remained at Guadalajara, and then proceeded to collect colonists. His first proposition was to take with him for a start six school teachers and six families of five persons each; but, as the Government undertook to give the colonists a free passage, maintenance during the voyage and half a dollar per day until their arrival in California, the number soon swelled to about a hundred and thirty. They consisted almost exclusively of the vagabond class; were idle, thriftless and vicious; not much, if any, superior to the convicts with which California had already been repeatedly cursed. At the same time Padrés collected another body of colonists of much the same class

[18] A remarkable way of executing the last will of the founders of that fund. It was established for the spread of Religion, not for the convenience of freebooters; but then we have learned ere this that to "Liberal" politicians nothing is sacred that savors of Religion. On this subject they stand far beneath the heathen of every period and clime. How else explain that with such anti-Christian politicians church property is less sacred than merchandise? and that when they obtain control they hasten to confiscate and desecrate what is dearest to the people, because dedicated to Almighty God, whilst the property of the merchants and of worldly corporations is not molested? Naturally to such insatiable and faithless politicians mission property was but a savory morsel.

[19] Bancroft, iii, 260-261.

and character and about the same in number as those of Híjar. In getting up their scheme they had published it under the name of *Compañía Cosmopolitana;* and they induced their followers to believe that they were about to be led to assured and easy prosperity; but those who were most intimately initiated into the enterprise, well knew that it contemplated the confiscation of all the missions, and the administration of their properties as the only field in which profit was to be made and fortunes won; and that these and not colonization, were the real objects at which both Híjar and Padrés were aiming.[20]

Híjar and Padrés with their deluded three hundred colonists in July, 1834, sailed from San Blas on the two ships *Natalia* and *Morelos.* The former arrived at San Diego on September 1st, 1834. The other vessel, with Padrés and part of the immigrants, reached Monterey on September 25th, only to find that the finely-spun project had miscarried. It came about in this way. Santa Ana had meanwhile again seized the reins of government, and promptly revoked the political and military appointments bestowed upon Híjar and Padrés respectively by the vice-president. As the schemers had already sailed away, Santa Ana despatched a courier by land to Monterey with orders for Governor Figueroa not to surrender his office to Híjar, but to stay at his post. The courier was promised a reward of three thousand dollars if he reached his destination in time to prevent the transfer. The courier was a man of determination. Despite some mishaps and hardships, he accomplished the task of riding from the capital of Mexico to the capital of California in forty-five days and there placed the documents in Figueroa's hands on September 11th. It was much the quickest trip on record over the same route.[21]

Figueroa had received no official notice respecting the colonists, but he thought it well to make preparations for

---

[20] Hittell, ii, 191-192; Bancroft, iii, 261-264.

[21] Bancroft, iii, 262-271; Hittell, ii, 191-193; Forbes, 142-144; Robinson, 167-168.

their coming. With that object in view he visited Santa Rosa Valley, and there selected a site for the new town. On his return he sent to Santa Cruz and other places for supplies, and then awaited the arrival of the immigrants. When Padrés on September 25th reached Monterey with his part of the colonists, he claimed the position of military commander; but in vain. He then presented his appointment as assistant director of colonization and officially demanded aid for the people he had brought along. Figueroa had received no instructions to that effect, and therefore had no authority for expending the public funds for benefit of the colonists. On October 14th Híjar came up from San Diego by land with the remainder of the immigrants. When the governor showed him the order forbidding the transfer of the civil authority, Híjar felt bitterly disappointed, but then fell back upon his commission as director of colonization. This Figueroa consented to recognize. Two days later, October 16th, Híjar demanded to be put in possession of the mission property in accordance with the first article of his instructions.

The instructions were dated Mexico, April 23rd, 1834, and consisted of the fifteen articles reproduced here in substance. 1. He will begin by taking possession of all the property belonging to the missions of both Californias.[22] The military commander[23] is to furnish all the aid required. 2. For a year from their arrival each colonist is to receive fifty cents a day, or twenty-five cents if under four years of age. 3. The traveling expenses are to be paid by the government, and the colonists are to receive the equipments bought for their transportation. 4. This article treats of the selection of favorable sites for the new settlements. 5. The frontier is to be settled as soon as possible. 6. This article deals with the plan of the new towns. 7. Special

[22] That was the shortest way to put an end to the missions. Being governor he could have it all his own way.

[23] Padrés as military commander would send the soldiers, if opposition ensued. It was all planned very nicely. Only for Santa Ana it would have succeeded.

care shall be taken to attach the Indians to the settlements, mixing them with the other inhabitants, but not permitting any settlement composed of Indians exclusively.[24] 8. This article discusses house lots. 9. Each family of colonists is to receive certain land, live-stock and implements from the *mission property of course,* as Bancroft remarks.[25] 10. Farming lands are to be granted in full ownership. 11. After the distribution of the movable property belonging to the missions has been made,[26] one-half of what is left shall be sold to the best advantage. 12. Not over two hundred head of stock of the same kind shall be sold to one family. 13. The remaining half of the movable property shall be kept on government account and to be devoted to paying for the expenses of Divine Worship, support of the missionaries, education, and the purchase of implements for the colonists.[27] 14. The governor and director is to report in detail at first and annually on the disposition and condition of the property after the distribution. 15. He is also to report at least once a year on the condition and needs of the colonists.[28]

Figueroa placed Híjar's demands before the legislative

[24] This, too, was nicely planned. The Indians would be used to do the work for the colonists, but have no home of their own. They would practically have been slaves. No wonder even Bancroft is shocked at the audacity of the schemers. "I deem it unlikely," he says (iii, 345), "that there was any intention of perpetrating so gross an outrage as was implied in a literal interpretation of the instructions considered independently of other laws." However, what the Picos, Bandinis, etc., effected later on in virtue of Figueroa's decree amounted to this gross outrage of robbery, degradation, and slavery of helpless Indians.

[25] The Indian's share was not considered, it seems. No mention is made as to his rights in the premises.

[26] No mention is made of the Indians. Bancroft himself is puzzled.

[27] colonists only! but what of the Indians? Was there ever a more wicked scheme concocted by men who claimed to be Christians? but these were "Liberals," who even in our day deal with ecclesiastical property in the same ruthless manner.

[28] Bancroft, iii, 273; 344.

assembly convened for the purpose on the next day, October 17th. What the result would be can well be guessed. "The members of that body," Bancroft relates, "had but a few years earlier been partisans of Padrés, or at least were largely under the influence of those partisans, such as Bandini, Vallejo, and Osio; but, though we may be sure the ayudante inspector exerted all his eloquence and influence to retain the favor of his old friends, his power over them seems to have been lost. Vallejo and Alvarado admit candidly that the chief reason for this defection was the fact that Padrés had brought with him twenty-one Mexicans to become administrators of the missions; whereas, under the old plans, the Californians were to have those places. Figueroa's mission policy was substantially identical with that of Echeandía and Padrés in the past, to which the Californians had committed themselves. He had actually made a beginning of secularization; all was going well, and the Californians were filling the desirable places. Why should they favor a change in behalf of strangers?" [29] "Vallejo, Osio, Alvarado, and other Californians denounced the whole colonization plan of Híjar and Padrés as a deliberately concocted plan to plunder the missions under the protection of the highest political and military authorities." [30]

The legislative assembly referred the question to a committee consisting of José A. Carrillo, Pio Pico, and Joaquín Ortega, and finally rejected the claims of Híjar and Padrés. During the following December and later a majority of the colonists were gradually brought together at San Francisco Solano, which mission was already in charge of Mariano Vallejo as comisionado for the confiscation, or seculariza-

[29] The Californians, of course, claimed the missions as booty for themselves.

[30] Bancroft, iii, 274; 264. The same is true of their own plan carried out shortly after under the name of "secularization." In the former case the would-be plunderers were Mexicans, in the latter case the plunderers were the sons of Mexicans who preferred to pass as Californians. That was the whole difference. Really, the Vallejos, Osios, and Alvarados in denouncing Híjar were condemning themselves.

tion as the covetous mission enemies chose to call the transaction which will be described ere long. Finally the idea of establishing a new town was abandoned, and each settler was permitted to select his own place of residence and employment. Thus the colony was disorganized and the members were scattered over the territory. Híjar and Padrés were in the end banished from the country, and on March 26th, 1835, sailed away from San Francisco on board the *Rosa.*[31]

In this connection it will contribute materially towards understanding the true inwardness of the war on the missions, if we dwell a little on the actions and vicissitudes of the third chief plotter, Juan Bandini, the congressman from California in Mexico, and vice-president of the Padrés colonization swindle. If, like his worthy predecessor Carlos Antonio Carrillo, Juan Bandini had manfully stood up for the rights of the mission Indians and insisted that the mission property, which had been accumulated for the neophytes by the missionary Fathers and the Indians alone, and which for more than thirty years had made it possible for the territorial government and its troops to continue in California, be held intact for the neophytes, the so-called "secularization" decree of August 17th, 1833, might have been deferred indefinitely, or the neophytes would have received what was coming to them of right and in virtue of the law of 1813; but insatiable cupidity had stifled every feeling of gratitude as it had smothered the conscience of Bandini and his confederates at home. Hence it was that he betrayed his trust, and labored for the iniquitous measures which were intended to deprive the neophytes of their property as well as of their fatherly guides and guardians; but as in the case of Híjar and Padrés, his treachery only ended in disgraceful defeat and bitter disappointment. The account will come more appropriately from Bancroft. We shall therefore let that historian and partisan expose the shady transactions of one of the worst enemies of the friars. It fur-

[31] Bancroft, iii, 275-280; 288.

nishes another proof that the loudest bawlers against Catholic religious anywhere are usually dyed-in-the-wool rascals themselves.

"Bandini was, as we have seen, the leading spirit in the grand scheme of Híjar and Padrés, and in the Compañía Cosmopolitana. Though not able to close the port of Monterey in favor of San Diego as he wished,[32] he did obtain an appointment as visitador, or inspector of the California custom-houses.[33] He started for home with the Padrés colony in 1834, filled with the most enthusiastic hopes. Member of a great commercial company without investing one cent of capital, in a sense the representative of the company in California, having at his disposal a stanch vessel, Híjar and Padrés in full possession of the political and military power, the mission wealth virtually under the control of his associates, and last, but far from least, himself provided with a commission by virtue of which he could remove such obstacles to his interests as might arise in the revenue department, the road to a princely fortune seemed broad and open before the ambitious ex-congressman.

"The failure of the general (colonization) scheme, in its political, military, and even commercial aspects, has been sufficiently noticed. He was not more successful than Híjar in securing recognition of his authority. In the autumn of 1834, soon after his arrival, he presented his credentials to Ramírez, the administrator, and announced his purpose to begin by inspecting the Monterey custom-house. Ramírez was a man always disposed to look out for his own interests; and, though supposed to be a partisan of the colony clique, he foresaw the triumph of Figueroa, and deemed it wiser to save something from the general wreck for himself than for Bandini. He accordingly declined to permit any interference in his office until orders to that effect should come from his superior officer, the director de rentas in Mexico. In vain

[32] In October 1833 he had introduced a bill to that effect, but failed.

[33] Placed in charge of Ángel Ramírez, as we have seen earlier in this chapter.

did Don Juan entreat and argue and protest; Don Ángel had the advantage, being doubtlessly supported by Figueroa. He declined to yield or to enter into any controversy, and reported the state of affairs to his superior. He also ordered his subordinate officials at other ports not to submit to Bandini's interference, though the latter had things very much his own way for a time at San Diego, which he persisted in regarding as the open port of California.

"Whether Ramírez ever received any order from the director does not appear. Bandini afterward declared that such an order was received and disregarded. However this may have been, Don Ángel (Ramírez) soon found a more effective weapon against his opponent, in an accusation of smuggling. Bandini had brought from Acapulco on the *Natália*, of which he was the supercargo, various effects, exceeding $2000 in value, for his own use and for sale on his own account. These goods were landed at San Diego free of duties, on the assurance of the visitador (Bandini) that all was *en régle*, except a small quantity lost in the wreck at Monterey. An investigation was made by Judge Castillo Negrete. The facts were clear enough. Bandini himself confessed the introduction of the goods, with no explanation as far as can be known. The judge accordingly suspended him from office, declaring the goods confiscated, together with the sum of $700 due the accused from the territorial treasury.[34]

[34] The temporary suspension was dated May 7th, 1835, and it was made permanent May 14th, 1836. The goods smuggled in by Bandini included six bales of sugar, twenty-five cases of table oil, one barrel of tobacco, some wine, ribbons, and jewelry, and six or eight bales of unknown effects. Californians later frequently spoke of this traducer of the friars as "Banditi," it appears, not without reason. Richard H. Dana in his "Two Years Before The Mast," 276-277, also draws a most unflattering picture of "Don" Juan. As to the integrity and morality of the other conspirators against the missions, we refer the reader to Bancroft's Biographical Sketches which are scattered through vols. ii-v. It will be seen that the enemies of the friars without any exception were birds of a feather. They should have been the last to accuse the faithful missionaries of evil-doings.

"Bandini's disappointment and indignation at this disastrous ending of all his brilliant hopes for wealth and power may be more adequately imagined than described. He lost no opportunity during the next few years of reporting in writing upon his wrongs, and even tried to collect his salary; but he received no attention whatever from the Mexican authorities, etc." [35]

[35] Bancroft, iii, 369-373.

CHAPTER XIII.

Decree against Monks and Nuns.—Stupid Ignorance of the Authors.—Fr. Durán's Expressive Note.—The Mexican Congress Enacts a Secularization Decree.—Not Satisfactory to the Californians.—The Reason.—Spirit of the Mexican Government.—Assault on the Pious Fund.—Another Secularization Decree.—Figueroa and the Californians.—Trick of the Governor.—His Own "Secularization" Project.—Satisfactory to the Californians.—Adopted.—Text of the Decree.—A Supplementary Decree.

WE have now to go into detail on the *crime of the nineteenth century*. The mission despoilers and their abettors chose to call it "secularization," but it was nothing less than brutal confiscation which resulted in the annihilation or dispersion of the Indian converts. Chiefly through the machinations of the infamous pair, Hijar and Padrés, and their unscrupulous tool Juan Bandini who misrepresented California at the Mexican capital, the first law on the subject by way of introducing the scheme passed Congress on August 17th, 1833. Ere this decree reached Governor Figueroa, the same body enacted another law, and it received the approval of President Santa Ana. This brings into plain view the true character of the men who controlled the destinies of the unhappy republic.

"Until then," says Alamán, "the first article proclaimed by all successive revolutions had been the preservation of Religion. Now three different attacks were directed against her discipline and institutions. The third of these was leveled at monastic Orders under the belief that thereby these would be entirely suppressed."[1] A copy of the insidious measure, with a proclamation of the Mexican President promulgating it, was transmitted to Governor Figueroa by the Minister of Justice and Ecclesiastical Affairs. Figueroa in turn forwarded both

---

[1] Alamán, "Historia de Mejico," v, 860. The other two measures were aimed at the liberty of the Church and the maintenance of the clergy.

documents to Fr. Presidente Duran under date of January 17th, 1834. Fr. García Diego of the Zacatecan Fathers doubtless also received a copy.

The message read as follows: "The President of the United Mexican States to the inhabitants of the Republic. Know ye that the Congress has decreed the following: 'The civil laws which impose any kind of coercion for the fulfillment of monastic vows shall be abolished.'[2] José Maria Berriel, President of the House of Deputies. Manuel Aguillera, Vice-President of the Senate. Vicente Prieto, Secretary of the House of Deputies. Vicente Madero Emoidas, Secretary of the Senate. I therefore command that this be published, circulated, and due observance be given to it. Palace of the Federal Government in Mexico, November 6th, 1833. Antonio López de Santa Ana.—By order, Andrés Quintana Roo.

"In order that what has been decreed might be the better observed, His Excellency, the President, was pleased to call attention to the following articles: 1. The religious of both sexes, as far as the civil authority is concerned, are absolutely free to live or not to live in the cloister and under the obedience of their prelates. 2. Those who resolved to continue in the community of their respective convents and monasteries must observe the regulations of their institute, and must subject themselves to the authority of the prelates in office, or of those whom they may elect anew. 3. The Government, though it will protect the just liberty of the religious of both sexes who voluntarily desire to abandon the cloister, in conformity with what is decreed in this law, will also aid the prelates in those cases when their subjects, who resolve to continue to live in community, should fail in the respect they owe them, or should not acknowledge their authority and the ordinances directed towards the fulfillment of their duties and the observance of their institute. I communicate this to Your

---

[2] Under Spanish laws the religious, who wanted to live as such in his convent, could be forced by the government to observe his vows.

Honor for your information. God and Liberty. Mexico, November 6th, 1833."[3]

Innocent as these articles and the preceding law appear, "there was nothing," Alamán writes, "from which the authors promised themselves such a sure and sensational result as from the liberty conceded to the friars and to the nuns to leave their cloister. They supposed that many individuals, even Superiors, would avail themselves of the license. Instead everything remained without notable change. In many convents the nuns answered the invitation to abandon them by renewing the vows which obliged them to live in the cloister."[4] If those "liberal" Mexican politicians really believed that monks and nuns were detained in their convents against their own will, such politicians gave their knowledge of the Catholic Church and of her institutions a wretched testimonial. It was then, as now anywhere, far more easy for a religious to leave the shelter of the convent than it is or was for a member of the anti-Catholic secret societies, which have misgoverned Mexico for nearly a century, to sever his connection with the lodges. Monks and nuns are free to walk away at any time and to reveal all they have learned. There is no oath of secrecy, and they need fear no bodily harm.[5]

When Fr. Durán received the decree which tinkered with the life of religious at a period, too, when true statesmen would have discovered many serious questions which demanded urgent action, he wrote on the margin this laconical remark, *"Dilatavit infernus os suum."*[6] This indeed explained everything. The decree of "secularization" which Governor Figueroa on May 1st, 1834, laid before the territorial assembly, and all subsequent transactions of a like nature, only emphasized Fr. Durán's quotation. The text of the decree is herewith reproduced.

---

[3] "Santa Barbara Archives."

[4] "En muchos conventos de monjas respondieron á la invitacion de abandonarlos, renovando los votos que las obligaban á la clausura." Alamán, v, 862.

[5] See Appendix C.

[6] "Hell opened wide its mouth." Isaiah, v, 14.

"The Vice-President[7] of the United Mexican States in the exercise of the Supreme Executive Power to the inhabitants of the Republic. Know ye that the Congress General has decreed as follows:

"Article 1. The government shall proceed to secularize the missions of Upper California.

"Art. 2. In each of said missions a parish shall be established, served by a priest of the secular clergy, with a stipend of from $2000 to $2500 a year, as the government may decide.[8]

"Art. 3. These parish curates shall not recover or receive any fees for marriages, Baptisms, or under any other name. As regards fees for pomp, they shall be entitled to receive such as may be specifically named in the list to be made out for that purpose with the least possible delay by the Bishop of the Diocese, and approved by the Supreme Government.

"Art. 4. To the parishes shall be given the churches with the sacred vessels, vestments, and other articles now possessed by each; and also such rooms adjoining the church as in the judgment of the government may be deemed necessary for the decent service of the parish.

"Art. 5. The government shall cause a burial ground to be laid out for each parish but away from the population.

"Art. 6. Five hundred dollars a year are appropriated for public worship and for the sacristan of each parish.

"Art. 7. Of the buildings belonging to each mission, the most suitable shall be assigned as residence for the curate, with land not exceeding two hundred varas square; and the other buildings shall be used for a town-house, primary schools, public establishments, and workshops.

"Art. 8. In order to provide promptly and effectively for the spiritual needs of both Californias, a vicar-general shall

---

[7] Valentín Gómez Farías, the friend of Híjar and Padrés, in the absence of President Santa Ana, who at that time was again on the war-path.

[8] The Franciscans had during sixty years and more done the work for nothing.

be appointed, who shall reside at the capital of Upper California but with jurisdiction over both territories; and the bishop shall confer upon him the corresponding faculties as complete as possible.

"Art. 9. As a compensation the vicar-general shall receive annually $3000, and he shall perform his duties free of charge, demanding nothing under any pretext whatsoever, not even for paper.

"Art. 10. If for any reason whatever the curate of the capital or of any other parish in the territory shall act as vicar, he shall receive $1500 in addition to his stipend as curate.

"Art. 11. No custom shall be introduced which obliges the inhabitants of California to make offerings, however pious they may be, or however necessary they may be declared; neither time nor the consent of the said inhabitants shall give them any force or weight whatsoever.[9]

"Art. 12. The government shall effectually care that the bishop do his part, as far as he is concerned, to carry out the objects of this law.

"Art. 13. The Supreme Government shall provide for the gratuitous transportation by sea of the new curates that may be appointed as well as for their household; and in addition it may give to each one for the journey by land from $400 to $800, according to the distance and the number of persons in his household which he brings along.

"Art. 14. The government will pay the traveling expenses of the missionary religious leaving the missions; and in order that they may comfortably return by land to their colleges or convents, there may be allowed to each one from $200 to $300; and, at discretion, whatever may be necessary in order that those who have not sworn to support the independence, may leave the republic.

---

[9] The freebooters would prevent even the widow's mite if they could! Strange Catholics! Rather, they were not Christians at all, otherwise they would not have endeavored to reduce to a minimum the service rendered to the Creator.

"Art. 15. The Supreme Government will meet the expenses arising under this law *out of the products of the estates, capital, and revenues at present known as the Pious Fund of the California Missions.*"[10]

This decree of August 17th, 1833, in line with the law of 1813 substituted secular for regular priests, confined them to the care of the spiritual wants of the neophytes, and left the property in the hands of the Indians as the law of 1813 expressly provided. Although the measure was ill-timed and unsuitable, like a dress made for a woman but to be worn by an infant, the old missionaries would under other circumstances have hailed it with rejoicing as a relief from an intolerable burden; for after all the decree secured the Faith and property of the neophytes against aggressors.[11] The covetous Californians, on the other hand, would have suffered bitter disappointment, inasmuch as through the decree of the Mexican Congress all their machinations to obtain possession of the Indian land and property as well as the cheap service of the neophytes, and the consequent life of ease and pleasure, would have come to naught. Unfortunately for the neophytes, outside the circle of the devoted missionaries little or no sympathy for the spiritual or temporal welfare of the Indians existed in either Mexico or California. Cupidity, unrestrained by religious principles which had been thrown overboard lest they interfere with liberty as the politicians chose to understand it, had seized especially the governing classes. Hence it was that, doubtless at Padrés's and Híjar's instigation, only three months later, November 26th, the Mexican Congress

---

[10] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Col. ii, 235-236; Dep. St. Pap. Monterey ii, 184; Dwinelle, "Colonial History," Addenda no. xv; Bancroft, iii, 336-337; Hittell, ii, 181-182.

[11] How eager the Fathers were for the execution of the decree we learn from a letter which Fr. Durán wrote to Figueroa July 22nd, 1834. "Soon it will be a year since the law was given, but as yet we do not see a beginning made to put it into practice."—"Luego hará un año que está dada la ley, y todavia no vemos principio de ponerla en práctica."—"Archb. Arch.," no. 2182. Nevertheless, in the same letter he warns the governor against setting the Indians entirely free.

manifested its true animus somewhat more openly than it had dared to express in the decree of August 17th. The Government was then authorized "to adopt all measures to insure the colonization, and make effective the secularization of the missions, of Upper and Lower California, *using for that purpose in the most convenient manner the estates of the Pious Fund*[12] of those territories, in order to furnish resources to the commission and families now in this capital and intending to go there.[13]

This was not enough. It seems some hesitation became manifest in certain quarters. The Mexican Congress, therefore, hastened to enact the following decree on April 16th, 1834, about two weeks before the Padrés Colony set out for California: "The Congress General has decreed as follows: Article 1. All the missions of the republic shall be secularized. Art. 2. The missions shall be converted into curacies, the limits of which shall be designated by the governors of the States where said missions exist. Art. 3. The decree is to go into full force within four months from the date of its publication."

This law Vice-President Valentín Gómez Farías ordered published on the same day.[14] The real object of all this legislation came out clear in the Instructions given to Híjar, especially in the first article which read, *"He shall begin by taking possession of all the property belonging to the missions of both Californias."*[15] This was dated only seven days later than the preceding decree, that is to say, on April 23rd. It was the last favor which Valentín Gómez Farías was permitted to confer on his friends, because Santa Ana a few days later seized the reins of government; but for some reason or

---

[12] This was sacrilegious robbery, inasmuch as the Pious Fund had been established for the spread of Religion.

[13] "Cal. Arch.," Sup. Gov. St. Pap. x, 47; Dep. St. Pap., San José ii, 603; Dep. St. Pap., Monterey iii, 1; Bancroft, iii, 337; Hittell, ii, 185.

[14] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap. Mis. & Colon. ii, 1. It was published at Monterey on August 9th, 1834.

[15] See the Híjar Instructions in preceding chapter.

the other, not prompted by Religion at all events, Santa Ana at this period exhibited little hostility to the missionaries.

As already stated, Governor Figueroa submitted the law of August 17th, which the Mexican Congress had passed without awaiting his report of October 5th, 1833, to the legislative assembly with a request for advice as to its enforcement. After much discussion it was resolved on June 3rd, 1834, that the governor had no authority to execute the law, but that the Supreme Government should be urged not to delay secularization even in the absence of regular parish priests, since the friars could act as such temporarily.[16]

Though still doubtful as to his powers in the matter, Figueroa later resolved to proceed without awaiting special instructions from the Supreme Government. "The reason alleged," says Bancroft, "was that in the long interval between the passage and enforcement of the secularization law, the mission property was in danger of being wasted by mal-administration—a reason not wholly without force.[17] In reality, however, the position of Figueroa in 1834 did not differ much from that of Echeandía in 1831. Each desired to advance the scheme of secularization, each had instructions to that effect, each founded his action on a national law—of Spain in the one case and of Mexico in the other—each expected the early arrival of a successor, each preferred from motives of personal pride and for the personal interests of friends and supporters that the change should be inaugurated by himself rather than by his successor, and each had the support of the diputacion. Both knew perfectly well that they

[16] Figueroa and the assembly saw that the decree, based as it was on the law of 1813, merely secularized after the old style, that is to say, it left the property with the Indians whilst it substituted secular for regular priests. Otherwise they need not have hesitated to enforce it, if the law of 1813 meant all that the Californians claimed. The decree of August 17th simply went not far enough to satisfy the cupidity of young Californians. "Secularization," as Bancroft himself admits (iii, 345), "included as an essential element, by the whole spirit of Spanish laws, distribution of mission lands and property to the Indians." See also Bancroft, iii, 340.

[17] This is nothing less than a libel on the friars.

had strictly no legal right to act in the matter, and that the motives alleged, though of some weight,[18] were not urgent for immediate action; yet both chose to assume the responsibility of such action. Figueroa's act, if somewhat less arbitrary and uncalled for than that of Echeandía, *was none the less a trick.*" [19]

Figueroa's "provisional regulations for the secularization and administration of the missions were proposed to the diputacion on July 19th by the Carrillos. Don Carlos was for some reason, doubtless satisfactory to himself, less radically opposed to secularization than he had been a few years earlier.[20] After a full discussion they were approved article by article in the secret sessions of July 30th and 31st, re-read and finally approved on August 2nd, and officially promulgated in a printed bando by the governor on August 9th." [21] This *Reglamento Provisional,* as it was called, reads as follows:

"Article 1. The governor, in accordance with the spirit of the law of August 17th, 1833, and with his instructions received from the Supreme Government, and acting in accord with the prelates of the missionary religious,[22] will partially convert into pueblos the missions of the territory beginning at once in this month of August,[23] with ten missions and continuing with the rest in succession.

---

[18] This, too, is only a slur on the part of Bancroft.

[19] Bancroft, iii, 341. The italics are ours.

[20] As will be remembered he had defended the missionaries in congress.

[21] Bancroft, iii, 342.

[22] A bold assertion. Fr. Durán and Fr. García Diego merely had advised making an experiment with some of the older missions, if Figueroa determined at all hazards to secularize them under the law of 1813; but they also warned him that, though under the law of 1813 nearly all were "ready" as far as years of existence were concerned, the neophytes themselves were by no means ready for such an advanced state of citizenship, and that disaster would be the inevitable result. Figueroa himself had in effect reported the same view to the Supreme Government. See chapter xi.

[23] "próximo mes de Agosto," next August, according to the original, for the discussion occurred in July.

"Art. 2. The missionary religious will be relieved of the administration of the temporalities, and will exercise the functions of their ministry only in what pertains to spiritual matters until the formal division of parishes is made, and the Supreme Government with the bishop provide parish priests.

"Art. 3. The territorial government will reassume[24] the administration of the temporalities, directively, on the following basis.

"Art. 4. The Supreme Government will, by the quickest route, be requested to approve this Provisional Reglamento.[25]

Distribution of Property and Lands.

"Art. 5. To each individual head of a family, and to all who are over twenty years of age, although they have no family, will be given from the mission lands, whether irrigable or not, a plot of land not more than four hundred and not less than one hundred varas square. In common enough land will be assigned them to pasture their live-stock. Community lands shall be allotted to each pueblo, and at the proper time municipal lands also.

"Art. 6. Among the same individuals there shall be divided in proportionate and equitable shares, according to the judgment of the governor, one-half of the live-stock, taking as a basis the latest reports on all kinds of stock as presented by the missionaries.

"Art. 7. There will also be distributed to them proportionately, one-half or less of the chattels, implements, and seeds on hand which are indispensable for cultivating the soil.

---

[24] A misstatement. Assume is the right term, for the temporalities, having been created and managed by the missionaries, had never been administered by the government.

[25] Figueroa and the assembly should then have postponed the execution of their resolution until it was approved by the Supreme Government. Cupidity on the one hand and pride on the other made them disregard both justice and propriety, and, as there was no court to appeal to, the missionaries with their wards stood helpless.

"Art. 8. All the remaining lands, buildings, goods, and property of every kind will stay in the care and under the responsibility of the mayordomo or employee, whom the governor will appoint, at the disposal of the Supreme Federal Government.

"Art. 9. From the common mass of this property provision shall be made for the subsistence of the missionary Fathers, the pay of the mayordomo and other servants, for the expenses of worship, schools, and other objects of public order and propriety.

"Art. 10. The governor, inasmuch as he is charged with the control of the temporalities, will after the necessary investigation determine and regulate all the expenses which it may be needful to make as well for the execution of this plan as for the conservation and increase of the property.

"Art. 11. The missionary will choose that part of the mission buildings which suits him best for his habitation and for that of his attendants; and he shall be provided with the necessary furniture and utensils.

"Art. 12. The library, sacred vestments, church goods and furniture shall be in charge of the missionary Father under the care of the person who acts as sacristan, whom the same Father may select, and who shall be paid just wages for his labor.

"Art. 13. General inventories shall be made of all the existing property of each mission, all duly classified according to the different branches; of the account books and of all kinds of documents; of the debts and credits, of which documents and information an account shall be forwarded to the Supreme Government.

Political Government of the Pueblos.

"Art. 14. The political government of the pueblos shall be organized in entire conformity with the existing laws; the governor will give the rules suitable for the establishment of the town councils and the holding of elections.

"Art. 15. The economical government of the pueblos shall

belong to the town council; but as far as regards the administration of justice in contentions, they shall be subject to the primary judges constitutionally established in the nearest places.

"Art. 16. The emancipated Indians will be obliged to take part in the indispensable community work which in the judgment of the governor may be deemed necessary for cultivating the vineyards, orchards, and fields which for the present remain undistributed until the Supreme Government directs otherwise.

"Art. 17. The emancipated Indians will render to the missionary Father the personal service necessary.

Restrictions.

"Art. 18. They cannot sell, burden nor alienate under any pretext the lands which may be given them; nor can they sell their live-stock. The contracts made against these orders shall be of no value; the government will reclaim the property as belonging to the nation, and the buyers shall lose their money.

"Art. 19. The lands, the owners of which die without heirs, shall revert to the power of the nation.

General Rules.

"Art. 20. The governor will name the comisionados whom he may judge necessary for the execution of this plan and its incidents.

"Art. 21. The governor is authorized to settle any doubt or matter which may arise with regard to the execution of this reglamento.

"Art. 22. Until this reglamento is put into force the Rev. Missionary Fathers are prohibited from slaughtering cattle in considerable quantities, except the usual number which is customary for the subsistence of the neophytes, and without waste.

"Art. 23. The debts of the missions shall be paid in pref-

erence out of the common mass of property at the time and in the manner as the governor may determine.

"In order that this law may be exactly carried out the following rules shall be observed:[26]

"1. As soon as the comisionados receive their appointment and orders they shall proceed to the respective missions and shall begin to execute the plan, conducting themselves in everything according to its tenor and in keeping with these rules. They shall present their respective credentials to the friar in whose charge the mission may be, and with whom they are to preserve harmony, politeness, and whom they shall treat with due respect.

"2. The Fathers will immediately deliver and the comisionados will receive the books of accounts and the other documents relating to credits and debts. The general inventories will then be drawn up in accord with Article 13 of this reglamento, of all property, including houses, churches, workshops, and other localities, stating what belongs to each department, that is to say, utensils, furniture, implements, or other articles which pertain to each. After the enumeration of what belongs to the house follows that which pertains to the field, that is to say, things productive, such as vineyards, orchards with the number of trees if it be possible, mills, etc.; after that the live-stock and whatever pertains to it; but as it will be difficult to count them as well on account of the multitude as on account of the lack of horses, an estimate shall be given by two intelligent and honest persons who shall calculate approximately the number of each species, and this shall be entered in the inventory. When all has been entered in the inventory in regular form, *it shall be kept from the knowledge of the friars*[27] and be in charge of the comisionado or mayordomo; no innovation shall be made in the system of the labor and servants until experience

[26] Such unscrupulous "liberal" lawmakers were great in devising minute rules for others rather than for themselves. We have learned as much far back from Felipe de Neve.

[27] "quedará inhibido del conocimiento de los religiosos." Were the authors afraid of being exposed?

proves it to be necessary, except in those common things which ordinarily change whenever it is convenient.

"3. In harmony with the mayordomo the comisionado shall see that all superfluous expenses cease by establishing rigid economy in all that merits reform.[28]

"4. Before making an inventory of field property, the comisionado will let the natives understand by explaining with sweetness and patience that the missions are to be converted into pueblos; that they are subordinate to the Fathers only in what pertains to the spiritual administration; that the land and property is to be distributed to them so that each may labor for himself, maintain and govern himself independently of any one; that the houses in which they live are to be adjudged to them as their property; that for this they have to subject themselves to what is ordered in this reglamento and these regulations, which will be explained to them in the best manner possible.[29] Likewise there will be assigned to them immediately the lots which they are to cultivate as provided in Article 5 of the reglamento. The comisionado, the missionary and the mayordomo will select the locality where they shall choose the best place most convenient to the population, and they will give to each so much ground as he can cultivate according to his aptitude and the size of his family without exceeding the maximum of land established. They will also see that each one marks his land in the manner which suits him most.

"5. The debts shall be paid from the common mass of property existing, but neither the comisionado nor the mayordomo shall pay such debts without an express order from the government to which a report must first be made on

---

[28] This was intended as a slur on the Fathers, but is rather amusing considering the quarter whence it comes: the young Californians.

[29] The neophytes may have wondered at the degree of liberty obtained. Thus far they had subjected themselves to solicitous and fatherly priests; now they were to subject themselves to hired, salaried, indifferent strangers! The Fathers had shared their income with them; would the new masters do as much?

the subject in order that of its own knowledge it may determine the number of cattle which is to be allotted to the neophytes, so that as soon as possible it may be done in conformity with what is provided in Article 6.

"6. The tools and implements necessary for labor shall be assigned in the quantities expressed in Article 7, for either individual or common use, as the comisionado and missionary may decide. The grain is to remain undistributed, but it shall be given to the neophytes in the quantity which has been customary.

"7. What is called the *monjério* shall cease immediately. The girls which it contains shall be turned over to their parents to whom the care which they must have for them should be recommended, and the obligation which they have as parents should be explained.[30] The same will be observed with regard to the boys.

"8. The comisionado, after he has acquired the information and knowledge, will as soon as possible propose to the government one or more individuals who seem to him capable and honest for mayordomo, according to what is directed in Article 8, be they those that at present are serving in the missions or others. He will also propose the salary which he thinks ought to be paid them according to their work at each mission.

"9. The rancherías which are situated at a distance from the missions, which consist of more than twenty-five families, and who want to organize a separate pueblo, may do so. The distribution of lands and goods shall be made in the same manner as is done for the rest. The rancherías which have not twenty-five families, provided they are firmly settled where they are, shall form a suburb and shall be attached to the nearest pueblo.

"10. The comisionado shall report the number of souls which each pueblo may have, in order to designate the num-

[30] This unwise provision must have been especially pleasing to the libertines of both races, but not conducive to virtue among the girls. For the consequences see Dana's description in next chapter.

ber of town employees, and cause the elections to be held. This will be done, as far as possible, in conformity with the law of June 12th, 1830.

"11. The comisionados shall adopt all executive measures, which the condition of things demands, giving an account to the government and consulting it in doubtful and serious matters.

"12. In everything else the comisionados, the missionary, the mayordomos, and natives will act as is prescribed in the reglamento.

"Monterey, August 9th, 1834. José Figueroa. Agustín V. Zamorano, Secretary." [31]

After the legislative assembly with Governor Figueroa had perpetrated this iniquity it seems to have adjourned on August 2nd, but reconvened in extra session on October 17th.[32] On November 3rd they again adjourned after completing the decrees authorizing confiscation by enacting the following regulations communicated to the friars by Governor Figueroa on November 4th, 1834:

"Art. 1. In conformity with the 2nd article of the law of the 17th of August, 1833, the amount of $1500 a year is assigned to the friars who exercise the functions of parish priests in the curacies of the first class, and $1000 to those of the second class.[33]

"Art. 2. As curacies of the first class shall be regarded

---

[31] "Sta. Barb. Arch."; Dwinelle, "Addenda," no. xix; Bancroft, iii, 342-344; Hittell, ii, 186-188. The wise political tailors had enlarged the dress to be worn by the infant so as to fit a giant.

[32] Alvarado acted as secretary until July 1st, when J. M. Maldonado took his place. Pio Pico was not sworn in till October 17th, but of course he acquiesced in what had been done, and joined in formulating the decree of November 3rd. See Bancroft, iii, 249-250. The names of the other worthies are found in chapter xii, this section.

[33] The amount was reduced because nothing could be expected from the Pious Fund, and the missions were supposed to produce the salary. Figueroa to Fr. García Diego, November 4th, 1834. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

the two united settlements of San Diego and San Dieguito; San Luis Rey with Las Flores and annexed settlements; San Gabriel with Los Angeles; Santa Barbara Mission and presidio; San Carlos with Monterey; Santa Clara with San José de Guadalupe; the missions of San José, San Francisco Solano, San Rafael and the colony combined.[34] San Juan Capistrano, San Fernando, San Buenaventura, Santa Inés with Purisima, San Luis Obispo, San Miguel, San Antonio with Soledad, San Juan Bautista with Santa Cruz, and San Francisco de Asis with the presidio, shall be regarded as curacies of the second class. In the curacies composed of two or more pueblos the one named first shall be the chief place where the curate will reside, as for instance at the extinguished missions of San Diego and Santa Barbara.

"Art. 3. Agreeably to articles 8 and 9 of said law, the Rev. Fr. Comisario Francisco García Diego shall establish his residence at the capital, and the governor shall ask the Rev. Diocesan to bestow upon said prelate the necessary faculties of a vicario foraneo. He shall enjoy the salary of $3000 which is set apart by the same law.[35]

"Art. 4. The vicario foraneo and the curates will conform themselves in everything else to the said law of August 17th, 1833.

"Art. 5. Until the Government may provide regular parish priests, the respective prelates of the religious will do so temporarily in accord with the governor.

"Art. 6. In accordance with Article 6 of said law, $500 shall be paid annually for the expenses of worship[36] and of servers in each parish.

---

[34] Seven in all.

[35] The insufferable conceit and impertinence of the young Californians displayed in these regulations is remarkable. Fr. García Diego paid no attention to this particular one; besides, Fr. Durán was vicario foraneo already.

[36] "Culto." We do not wish to be captious, but it is to be observed that with Christians the term is "Culto Divino," "Divine Worship." The emancipated young Californians appear to be fond of copying and even surpassing their infidel monitors. Nowhere

"Art. 7. From the common mass of the property of the extinguished missions the salaries of the vicario foraneo and the curates, as well as the expenses for worship shall be paid either in money, if there be any, or in produce or other articles at current prices. The governor will give the necessary orders to that effect.

"Art. 8. Article 17 of the Reglamento Provisional on secularization which obliges the Indians to render personal service to the missionary is abrogated.[37]

"Art. 9. In conformity with Article 7 of said law,[38] the governor will assign the quarters for the habitation of the curates, town house, primary schools, public establishments and workshops.[39]

"Art. 10. The other points to which the observations of the Rev. Fr. Narciso extend, because of easy solution, will be settled by the governor, who is authorized by Article 21 of the Reglamento Provisional.[40]

"Art. 11. This resolution, including the decision, shall be communicated to the prelates in order that they may bring it to the knowledge of their subjects." [41]

---

is "Divine" allowed a place. Dwinelle feels the absence of the adjective and therefore kindly translates "Divine Worship"; but the original is simply "culto."

[37] Characteristic of the treatment priests received at the hands of "liberal" legislators and from these "hijos del pais."

[38] Law of August 17th, 1833.

[39] Figueroa's Reglamento allowed the missionary to select his quarters. It was but just and courteous. The Pico crowd thought this too considerate.

[40] It would seem that Fr. Durán had presented some objections. If so, the document is lost. It may refer to his statement reproduced in chapter xi, however.

[41] Figueroa to Fr. García, November 4th, 1834; "Sta. Barb. Arch."; Dwinelle, "Addenda," no. xx; Bancroft, iii, 347-348; Hittell, ii, 188-189.

CHAPTER XIV.

Hittell on the Act of Confiscation.—San Carlos Inventory.—How the Legislators Provided for Themselves.—Rich Harvest for the Administrators.—Portilla's Lament.—Neophytes Obstreperous.—Fr. Durán on Missions San Luis Rey and San Juan Capistrano.—Dana on the Result of the Confiscation.—How the Missionaries Bore Themselves.—Fr. Durán Hurt at Their Silence.—His Instructions.—The Friars Absolutely Detached and Disinterested.—Fr. Durán's Confidential Circular.—Satisfaction of the Friars.—Eager to Be Relieved.—Action of the Fr. Guardian of Guadalupe, Zacatecas.

"SUCH were the principles and method adopted for secularization," says Hittell. "Though it required some years to finish the ruin of the missionary establishments, this was the commencement of it. As for the Indian pueblos, which were to take their place, there was no success in any of them. Nor was any to be expected. In other cases *it has required hundreds of years to educate savages up to the point of making citizens, and many hundreds to make good citizens. The idea of at once transforming the idle, improvident and brutish natives of California into industrious, law-abiding and self-governing town people was preposterous.*[1] Figueroa himself saw and acknowledged this truth.[2] Though the law pronounced the Indians free, he recognized the fact that their unconditional liberty was equivalent to their perdition;[3] and

[1] Yet this is what the enemies expected the friars to accomplish in ten years! and they ceaselessly harped upon the ten years' limit of mission existence as one excuse for the "secularization." Italics are ours.

[2] It is strange that he nevertheless deprived the Indians of the solicitude of the missionaries. It will dawn upon the reader that the governor's act was not of his own volition.

[3] Just what the friars had always predicted. Why then were the neophytes withdrawn from the care of the missionaries who had gathered them in the fold? There was no reason besides cupidity, save the senseless hatred of "liberal" politicians for those who devote themselves to the exclusive service of God in a religious garb. To this hatred the welfare of a whole race of people is sacrificed.

he therefore ordered them to be kept in a sort of qualified tutelage [4] under the care and supervision of the mayordomos; and he directed that in the meanwhile they should be instructed in the duties of citizenship."[5]

Soon after the act of confiscation had been published comisionados were appointed to take up an inventory at each mission in company with the respective missionary. This was done during the months of November and December 1834. San Carlos Mission was one of the last. Its inventory is dated December 10th, and signed by Fr. José Maria del Real, the missionary in charge, and José Joaquín Gómez, the comisionado. The whole property of the mission, including the live-stock, was valued at $46,022, 7 reales, 10 granos. In this amount the church building is appraised at $10,000; the church furniture, sacred vessels, vestments, etc., and the library, which were likewise put on the list, were valued $10,217, 7 rls., 4 grs.[6] So the church property, too, was confiscated and put in the charge of secular officials! Such was and is the fashion under godless "liberal" control in Latin countries. The priest is merely tolerated and subject to the good pleasure or whims of those who happen to possess civil power; but we are anticipating.

From the character of the men who composed the territorial legislature, which passed the measure removing the missionaries from the temporal charge of the neophytes and of the mission property, we can easily infer that they were not slow to retrieve their dwindling fortunes by securing the positions created by their legislative acts. Pio Pico, for instance, took charge of Mission San Luis Rey. Carlos A. Carrillo secured San Buenaventura. Joaquín A. Ortega "administered" San Diego Mission. José Tibúrcio Castro assumed the management of Mission San Juan Bautista. Juan Bandini, who had been vice-president of the Híjar and Padrés

[4] Hittell now uses softer words. Under the unsalaried missionaries the Indians were "slaves"; under the hireling administrators they are in tutelage!

[5] Hittell, ii, 189.

[6] "Inventário de la Mision de San Carlos." "Sta. Barb. Arch."

mission robbery scheme, was consoled with the management of Mission San Gabriel. The loud-mouthed calumniator of the friars, Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, took into his keeping the whole country of which Mission Solano was the centre. Details on the subject regarding these and other missions must be reserved for the local history.

"Meanwhile the work of secularization was going on," Hittell tells us.[7] "It furnished a rich harvest for those engaged in it. No charge of corruption or unlawful gain was made or could have been sustained against Figueroa himself; and there may have been a few others engaged in the work equally clear of offense; but the great mass of the commissioners and other officials, whose duty it became to administer the properties of the missions, and especially their great numbers of horses, cattle, sheep and other animals, thought of little else and accomplished little else than enriching themselves. It cannot be said that the spoliation was immediate; but it was certainly very rapid. A few years sufficed to strip the establishments of everything of value and leave the Indians, who were in contemplation of law the beneficiaries of secularization, a shivering crowd of naked and, so to speak, homeless wanderers upon the face of the earth."[8]

Let us see how the new system worked at the largest and most prosperous mission under the old system of the friars, San Luis Rey. "Pablo de la Portilla, the comisionado of San Luis Rey, on December 20th, 1834,[9] wrote an account of the enfranchised Indians of that place, which furnished a fair exhibit of their condition throughout the territory," Hittell informs us. "They had absolutely refused to obey orders. The season for sowing wheat had come on and he had prepared the necessary plows; but nothing had been done for the

[7] We prefer to allow the virulent enemy of the friars, who generally voices the sentiments of Alvarado and his confederates, to describe the result of "secularization." His description is a confession of failure.

[8] Hittell, ii, 206-207.

[9] Only a few weeks after "secularization" had been put into practice!

reason that the Indians had been unwilling to work. They said they had at length become a free nation; and to prove it they left their houses and wandered off, abandoning the mission. He had sent various alcaldes to the sierra to endeavor by persuasion to induce them to return, but all in vain.[10] They would listen to no reason, it was impossible to make them understand or appreciate the advantages of industry and obedience;[11] nothing could change their obstinacy. They all with one voice cried out: 'We are free. It is not our pleasure to obey. We do not choose to work.' It was plain, Portilla continued, that this state of affairs would have to be remedied and the Indians reduced to subordination; but he had no troops to do it with. The liberty which had been given to the young women had been a special cause of disorder; for they had gone off into the mountains, and the men spent their time in following them.[12] They had taken nearly all the horses and mules, not leaving enough even for urgent requirements. The pastures were covered with the carcasses of cattle, which had been killed to steal their hides. In fine everything indicated the ruin of the country. From his knowledge of the Indians, gained by a residence and experience of fifteen years, he could foresee nothing but the most disastrous results from the policy adopted. The intentions of the government were doubtless praiseworthy. 'Liberty throughout the world' ought to be the cry of every good citizen; but the Indians of California did not possess the qualifications for liberty; and it was necessary for their preservation that something should be done to protect them against themselves." [13]

Such was the lament of an official before he had been able

---

[10] Echeandía and the Californians had praised the neophytes for such rebellious acts when the friars were in charge. They were now having a taste of their own medicine.

[11] Well, the neophytes had not become Christians in order to subject themselves to secular hirelings for the benefit of the latter.

[12] This goes to show that the "monjério" was a necessity, and that the methods of the Fathers were inspired by prudence as well as paternal love.

[13] "Cal. Arch.," Missions xi, 658-661; Hittell, 189-190.

CAPTAIN PABLO DE LA PORTILLA AT SAN LUIS REY URGES THE INDIANS TO GO TO WORK. THEY REFUSE.

to put the new plan into practice; the freebooters were only reaping what they had sown. Mission San Luis Rey was the very place, besides San Juan Capistrano, where Echeandía and Pico had succeeded in filling the minds of the neophytes under the friars with insincere talk on liberty and equality. The condition of affairs became so intolerable that Fr. Oliva, the missionary in charge, fell into despondency and Fr. Durán had to remove him to San Diego in charge of Fr. Fernando Martin. Indeed, the friars had already deliberated whether it might not be advisable to abandon the temporal management to their enemies, as the following communication of Fr. Durán to Governor Figueroa demonstrates:

"It seemed good to me," he writes only two weeks before the act of confiscation of August 9th, 1834, had been published, "to direct Fr. Buenaventura Fortuni to take Mission San Luis Rey, and to beg him to make the sacrifice for God's sake, and out of necessity. I have besought Don Pablo,[14] as the one in charge, to keep public order, but not to make a sensational show at the arrival and the departure of the respective Fathers.[15] This I deemed it well to communicate to



Signature of Fr. Buenaventura Fortuni.

Your Honor for the information that is due to you, and for the greater harmony as regards public order.

"What worries me is the fear that Fr. Buenaventura might lose courage at sight of the great disorder which reigns in that mission. I am advising him beforehand to come to an understanding with Don Pablo, so that they may in harmony and with deliberation and prudence apply a suitable remedy

[14] Portilla, comandante of San Diego, the same who complains about the rebellious spirit of the San Luis Rey neophytes.

[15] Fathers Buenaventura Fortuni and Vicente Oliva.

to what may still be remedied, and that, if he should find out that he cannot bear the burden of the temporalities, he should inform me, as I would ask Your Honor that a secular administrator be placed there to take charge of them and that the Father, receiving his support, should mind only the spiritual affairs. This is to be understood thus in case a long time is to elapse before the secularization of the missions,[16] because in case of a speedy secularization we must get along as well as we can. I do not know what to think. Soon it will be a year that the law [17] was passed, and yet we do not see a start made for putting it into practice.[18]

"I think Your Honor has seen Fr. Zalvidea's remarks made in the circular calling for aid.[19] It has attracted my attention very much. Your Honor thinks, as you have written to me some time past, that the temporal desertion of the mission by that religious is the principal cause for the decay of the mission.[20] I thought as much when I went down last year, and I remonstrated with the Father about the disorder I saw. He replied that he could not help it; that, far from finding support in the comandante of San Diego,[21] the latter was always on the side of the Indians; that if the Indians did not want a certain mayordomo this was sufficient for the comandante for taking him away on his own authority; and that everything he [22] wanted to put into some kind of order would cause a tumult. I myself met an Indian alcalde who insisted

[16] real secularization under the law of 1813, not confiscation.

[17] Law of August 17th, 1833, which went no farther than that of 1813, and merely substituted secular priests for the friars.

[18] This indicates how eagerly the Fathers looked for relief from the management of the temporalities, and contradicts the everlasting slander of the young Californians and their defending closet-historians, that the friars clung to the management of the missions for the purpose of enriching themselves, or for the sake of an easy life.

[19] Figueroa's usual demand for supplies.

[20] San Juan Capistrano. We have frequently noticed who was to blame.

[21] Pablo de la Portilla.

[22] Fr. Zalvidea.

that I [23] should remove a mayordomo without giving me any other reason than that *'he* [24] *was the magistrate and wanted no mayordomos.'* The Indians must be either entirely in *subjection* or entirely *free;* to wish to leave them midway seems to be impossible. Nor is any Father able to manage them.[25] I am satisfied that Fr. Zalvidea does not view this with indifference, because he is very exact in spiritual matters.[26] I cannot persuade myself that the fault lies with him; on the contrary, the insubordination of the Indians is to blame."[27] Hence Portilla had good reason to accuse himself for much of the disorder that prevailed, and for the rebellious spirit which he encountered in the neophytes. For the rest, Echeandía and his gang must shoulder the responsibility. Before his appearance in California the Indians were contented, and would have been exceedingly happy had not the necessity of supplying the troops deprived them of many advantages and pleasures which the kindly mission system enabled them to enjoy.

The iniquity, however, of the system evolved by Figueroa and his covetous California counselors, who composed the territorial assembly, will stand out more clearly as we describe the local conditions of each mission in subsequent volumes. For the present it may suffice to quote but one American eyewitness whose testimony agrees with that of other contemporaries. R. H. Dana in his "Two Years Before the Mast," [28] writes: "A law was passed stripping the missions of all their possessions, and confining the priests to their spiritual duties, at the same time declaring all the Indians free and independent *rancheros.* The change in the condition of the Indians was, as may be supposed, only nominal; they are virtually

---

[23] Fr. Presidente Narciso Durán.

[24] the Indian alcalde. The italics are Fr. Durán's.

[25] the Indians of San Juan Capistrano under the new conditions.

[26] Fr. Zalvidea was one of the most scrupulously faithful friars. People, according to Bancroft, v, 622, regarded him as a saint.

[27] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, July 22nd, 1834. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2182.

[28] pp. 194-195; 199.

serfs,[29] as much as they ever were; but in the missions the change was complete. The priests have no power, except in their religious character, and the great possessions of the missions are given over to be *preyed upon by the harpies of the civil power,* who are sent there in the capacity of *administradores,* to settle up the concerns; and who usually end, in a few years, by making themselves fortunes, and leaving their stewardships worse than they found them. The dynasty of the priests was much more acceptable to the people of the country, and, indeed, to every one concerned with the country, by trade or otherwise, than that of the administradores. The priests were connected permanently to one mission, and felt the necessity of keeping up its credit. Accordingly the debts of the missions were regularly paid, and the people were, in the main, well treated, and attached to those who had spent their whole lives among them; but the administradores are strangers sent from Mexico,[30] having no interest in the country; not identified in any way with their charge, and, for the most part, men of desperate fortunes, broken-down politicians and soldiers, whose only object is to retrieve their condition in as short a time as possible. The change had been made but a few years before our arrival [31] upon the coast, yet, in that short time, the trade was much diminished, credit impaired, and the venerable missions were going rapidly to decay. . . . Of the poor Indians very little care is taken. The priests, indeed, at the missions, are said to keep them very strictly, and some rules are usually made by the alcaldes to punish their misconduct; yet it all amounts to but little. Indeed, to show the entire want of any sense of morality or

[29] Under the mission system, before the confiscation, they were considered and treated as children; but under the system now introduced they were indeed regarded and treated as serfs. Calculating selfishness took the place of paternal solicitude. The evidence will not be wanting as we go on.

[30] Not correct; the young California politicians took care to secure the places for themselves and friends; the Padrés gang, it will be remembered, had been driven out.

[31] Rather a few months; for Dana landed at Santa Barbara January 14th, 1835.

domestic duty among them, I have frequently known an Indian to bring his wife down to the beach, and carry her back again, dividing with her the money which she had got from the sailors. If any of the girls were discovered by the alcalde to be open evil doers, they were whipped,[32] and kept at work sweeping the square of the presidio, and carrying mud and bricks for the buildings. Intemperance, too, is a common vice among the Indians."

The question naturally arises, how did the missionaries bear themselves during this trying period in the face of all the adverse legislation perpetrated in both Mexico and California? Just as might be expected of men so entirely detached from worldly things. "The Fathers," Bancroft says, "have not left themselves on record as having made any serious attempt to arrest enforcement of Figueroa's Provisional Regulations. It is unfortunate that even the views of the Fathers are not extant. Here and there a friar had a personal quarrel with the new administration about the assignment of rooms or servants, or presented a complaint that the ex-neophytes were ill-treated, but for the most part they were silent. . . . From the Fernandinos we hear nothing."[33]

Doubtless they suffered many vexations and were not spared occasional insults; nor could they be insensible to the injury inflicted upon the neophytes, whom they had ever regarded as their children; but they shut their sorrows up within themselves so much so that they appear to have concealed their privations and troubles from the very Fr. Presidente. At all events, Fr. Durán in a confidential circular affectionately chides the friars for their lack of filial trust. "I believe," he writes, "that there will always be some mortifica-

[32] Much ado was made about the mild kind of whipping as one of the punishments employed at the missions when nothing else would avail. Under the administradores and civil officers flogging seems to have been regarded as quite in order, even if applied without discretion.

[33] This is in strange contrast with Bancroft's and Hittell's assertions that the friars from mercenary motives firmly held on to the temporalities, and opposed every attempt to wrest the property from them. Bancroft, iii, 346-347; 352; 354.

tions to suffer; but Your Reverences should be assured that I will regard them as my own if you inform me about them, and I will seek the remedy from whomsoever a remedy may be obtained. I found it not a little strange that you have communicated to me so little of your sufferings, and that you have deprived me of the pleasure which I should enjoy in seeking an alleviation for you as well as I might, provided that the complaints be not vague and indeterminate, but supported by facts and explained by the circumstances."[34]

In the same circular Fr. Durán took occasion to instruct the friars concerning their duties under the new condition of affairs. Though a lengthy document it is well worth reproducing in the main at least. "May the Lord give us peace!" he writes. "As ministers of the Catholic Church, and as pastors of the souls which Divine Providence has placed in our charge, we must consider ourselves bound not only to feed them with wholesome food of doctrine and the Sacraments, but we are also bound by the same principles to keep from them poisonous foods which, couched in seductive, eloquent and apparently brilliant terms, are contained in many of the modern books. Under the false pretenses of wanting to impart to the youth and children an enlightened education, they instill dangerous maxims which not only despoil the youths of the very first Christian ideas received in tender infancy, but transform them into monsters of inhumanity and fierceness which in time must result in revolutions, blood, and murders. From such principles originated the widespread perversion of the French people, whose childhood and youth were poisoned through the reading of so-called philosophical works which had been distributed lavishly in the most insignificant villages, so that by means of them the unwary youth might drink in the venom which teachers of schools selected for that purpose held out to them, and which in due time produced the results of which we are eye-witnesses.[35]

---

[34] Fr. Durán, "Circular," Santa Barbara, January 20th, 1835. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[35] There is no doubt that the young Californians, such as the Vallejos, Bandinis, Picos, and Alvarados, acquired their bluster and

"I am far from saying that the schoolmasters or teachers, who have just been sent to this territory, belong to this class and have the same purpose as those of France; at the present date I have no reason or foundation to be positive on this point; nevertheless I have been informed that some one has brought his assortment of bad books which are corruptive of youth. Some one has told me that he brought the "Emilio" of Rousseau along.[36] All this gives reason to fear that these new teachers, or one of them intends to impress upon his pupils some of the maxims, which are not in conformity with those of the Gospel, under the pretext that they do not go beyond the sphere of politics, and have no relation to Religion, two things which in practice it is very difficult to keep apart in our times. I direct Your Reverences to use all possible vigilance to find out what manner of doctrinal food and maxims is given to the youth in the new schools, so that we may do our part as Catholic ministers and as shepherds of the souls entrusted to our keeping. Without it we could never render a good account to the Chief Shepherd, Christ Jesus. Hence, if Your Reverences should discover anything evil demanding a remedy, do not delay to notify me with the necessary prudence and evidence so that I may be able to take necessary steps before the governor, who as a Christian may be able to issue adequate orders in view of the political and religious damage that may arise from the corruption of the young through the spread of contrary maxims.

"Passing from the zeal which we must possess for the souls under our care to the perfection for which we must strive in virtue of our vocation as Franciscans, even in the new relations and circumstances in which the governor has seen fit to place us, I will here reproduce some of the declarations which

---

their contemptuous treatment of the missionaries from the reading of French infidel works, which had been early introduced or from those who had been corrupted by such works.

[36] One of the vilest of French books. The author himself was a moral leper. His works could hardly have any but corruptive results. Infidelity and moral corruption go hand in hand, as is evidenced especially in the France of Rousseau and Voltaire.

I made to the governor, in order that Your Reverences may know the manner and terms in which we shall adapt ourselves to the new regulations. Here is what I said in an official communication to him:

"'In view of our Franciscan mode of life I find myself bound to declare to Your Honor that, with regard to the assignment of $1000 and $1500 respectively made to the religious who attend the missions, it must be understood that we accept them merely as alms necessary for our subsistence, and as a means by which we procure what we need, after the manner observed with the stipends which the King of Spain was wont to allow us; for their Catholic Majesties and the first founders of the missions from the beginning agreed that they should not be considered in any other light than as alms, excluding all rights and civil obligations to pay or receive them, save the privilege of asking for them which belongs to him that asks for an alms.[37] In my name, therefore, and in the name of my religious I declare that we want to follow the religious spirit of our venerable predecessors in not considering the assignment as anything else than alms bestowed upon us, whatever be the name which the governor may have chosen to apply to the means for our support.

"'It seems to me also proper to remark that, all that has been decided by the Honorable Deputation regarding the appellations of curates, curacies, parish priests and parishes, must be considered as having no significance as far as ecclesiastical affairs are concerned, and nothing more than a provisional manner of expression which can have no effect until an agreement of the Supreme Government with our College

[37] That is to say, the Franciscans lay no legal claim to the salaries fixed by the legislative assembly or Governor Figueroa, and that even now, though acting as pastors, they refuse to accept anything save as voluntary alms. Yet Bancroft, particularly Hittell, and the whole collection of historical parrots, never tired of picturing the friars as mercenaries, who clung to the temporalities of the Indians for personal gain. Vallejo and other covetous Californians emphasized the slander in and out of season. Fr. Durán states nothing more than what the Franciscan Rule prescribed, and what the friars vowed and faithfully observed.

of San Fernando and the Bishop of Sonora shall canonically authorize such titles and their canonical signification. The religious are aware of this, and consequently they remain missionaries, and the churches remain missions as much as before, until the competent ecclesiastical sanction is given by whom it concerns. For this reason it is meet that in our relations with the government the names of curates and curacies be avoided until due time, a practice which I shall observe. Hence I am of the opinion that, after the declaration has been once made, that the assignments shall be bestowed and received as were the former stipends in the sense of alms, we shall leave it thus until necessity or other reasons dictate otherwise; but I do ask this much and earnestly supplicate that, in conformity with the general law of secularization which allots the most suitable quarters as the dwelling for the curates, and in conformity with the Provisional Reglamento which leaves it to the choice of the religious, Your Honor by no means should permit that the missionaries be forced to leave the apartments and reception rooms which they have occupied until now, as was attempted at San Luis Rey; for this would be a degradation full of partiality, and something which would not be ventured in the case of secular curates, that is to say, drive the religious out of their own homes which they or their brethren have built as localities most adapted for their communication with the churches.'

"The governor has agreed to all this, and he has directed and commanded the gentlemen entrusted with the administration of the missions that no innovations be made with regard to the mail, that is to say that, besides the monthly correspondence, we can correspond with one another by extra mail when an urgent need demands it, and we ask for it with the politeness becoming religious. If there occur any refusal or disrespect from the said gentlemen when you ask in that manner, you will notify me with as much evidence as possible, so that we may not appear to be acting for the sake of etiquette or from rivalry.

"I think it possible that, owing to the diversity of dispositions, one or the other among us may not be able to lead a

peaceful and harmonious life with some comisionado or mayordomo; in that case there is no remedy but to live apart in absolute independence of him. This independence we may enjoy by subsisting either according to the Reglamento or according to the Assignment.[38] If we accept the latter, it is clear enough, inasmuch as its very nature renders us more independent; for then we live according to our own account, though subject to our Franciscan Rules as said before. If we accept the Reglamento, it amounts almost to the same thing, because even in that case we are under no obligations, nor would I ever consent that we should be servile dependents, to the gentlemen *who have come to enjoy the fruits of our labor and hardships, and who have come to direct and manage certain advantages the creating of which has caused them no troubles,* but, on the contrary, whose principal and perhaps entire business is to exclusively enjoy as well the fruit of our personal labor as the value of the voluntary donation which we have made of our stipends in favor of the Indian communities.[39] For these reasons Your Reverences must in no way debase yourselves, nor cease to insist upon receiving what is just and in conformity with liberty and religious independence from any official who, perchance, may think that he has it in his power to mortify and oppress the sacred persons of Your Reverences like one who is dependent upon him for food and attendance,[40] for I am certain that the governor will

[38] See Figueroa's Reglamento Provisional of August 9th, 1834, and the subsequent regulations of the territorial assembly of November 3rd, 1834.

[39] Thus the California freebooters enjoyed not only the fruit of the labor of the Indians and missionaries, but also the stipends, alms, and donations which the Fathers had received since the year 1770, and added to the mission revenues. Clearly the Fathers had reason to feel outraged when they found themselves begrudged sufficient quarters and food at the missions which they had created and maintained as happened in places.

[40] The friars had always showed themselves too submissive to the whims of their enemies. This is the one fault to be found from Fr. Serra down. Fr. Durán tries to have them assert their rights. They should have refused to serve unless treated with deference.

remedy everything if the matter is placed before him in due form and with proofs. If, contrary to what is expected, it should not be remedied, then Your Reverences may consider yourselves relieved of religious obedience, as it cannot oblige save where there is a refectory and necessary assistance.[41]

"What I have said concerning the dependence of Your Reverences upon the comisionados for food and attendance, (even those who do not make use of or do not accept the assignment, but surrender themselves to the charity of said gentlemen), I mean it to refer to the hours and places where the meals must be furnished you, that is to say, that Your Reverences are free to arrange this; but in no way must you subject yourselves to the time and place which another may set apart for you. On the contrary, in this each one shall be free and unhampered to follow the same custom which he observed during the time of his domestic independence, if this suits him, so that no one else should change the division of time and the method of life to which he was accustomed."[42]

Two months later Fr. Durán in a Latin [43] circular issued additional instructions for the conduct of the friars under the peculiar conditions thrust upon them by the confiscation of the missions. It furnishes more evidence of the absolute detachment from worldly goods and aims as scrupulously observed by the Franciscans to the very last. Although the communication was marked confidential, it is reproduced here as evidence of the disinterestedness observed in the friars throughout the missionary period. "Inasmuch as by the secularization of the missions," Fr. Durán writes, "a real separation of the temporal goods which we use from those that belong to the com-

---

[41] That is to say, obedience is not binding against the laws of nature. The necessary food and raiment must be provided, or the subject is free to provide for himself.

[42] Fr. Durán, "Circular," Santa Barbara, January 20th, 1835. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[43] All communications were in Spanish, as a rule. For obvious reasons this circular was written in Latin, lest the hostile Californians take occasion to slander the Fathers if it fell into their hands. Fr. Durán wrote a classical Latin.

munities has been made and had to be made, it seems necessary to provide in time that our things, the use of which belongs to the Order, but the ownership of which pertains to the Holy Roman Church,[44] be not destroyed, alienated or appropriated by seculars with grave guilt to their conscience as well as ours, if God in His inscrutable Providence should permit any one of us to end his days in this country. Our General Constitutions on the observance of poverty under the head of Books direct that articles of minor value of the deceased should be brought to the Fr. Guardian, but those of greater value to the Minister Provincial for distribution.[45]

"Inasmuch, however, as we have neither of these two prelates near us, and we cannot possibly observe the letter of this law, let us observe it at least in the manner which is nearest and most conformable to our state and Rule, namely: by taking the belongings of those of us who may die to the prelate who at the time may be in the missions, in order that he may distribute them after the manner enjoined upon the guardians and provincials, in the meantime taking care, as I have already done, that this disposal of the things be brought to the notice of the Superiors of the College for their blessing and ratification.

"Hence, whoever of us may be present for the consolation and assistance of a friar who may be about to die, he shall prudently take charge of those useful articles, for instance books, which he had for his use, and draw up an inventory which after the death of the friar he must bring to the knowledge of the prelate, in order that he with his permission may transfer them to the use of other friars. In case, however, among such belongings any money should happen

[44] With Franciscans neither the individual nor the whole Order can own property; the ownership is vested in the Pope or the Church. The religious have only the use of the things they nominally possess.

[45] That was the case when the friar had belonged to a province, and intended to rejoin it after the statutory ten years, and if, as was necessary in California after this, he had to provide for himself. At the College or in the missions he could have possessed nothing except the Breviary and the manuscripts.

to be found, the friar in charge will see that it is delivered to Don José de la Guerra whom I have appointed temporary síndico [46] until he is lawfully elected by the College, to which like to the provincials, according to our statutes, pertains the exclusive right of such appointment, though the necessity of the better observing our Rule forced me to make it temporarily. Hence it is more conformable and more Franciscan-like, so to speak, to have the notable amount of money (if we should have it collected for some large expenditure, as for a voyage, which I consider not remote),[47] deposited with the said síndico for our common necessities, rather than in our own keeping or that of other strangers, lest perhaps overtaken by sudden death we be found provided with money, whereas we should be devoid of it.[48]

"As all this, however, should be done cautiously and prudently, so that those who are against us may be put to shame for having nothing evil to say about us, it may perhaps be well, if those things which most excite the cupidity of men be immediately locked in a case addressed to the prelate, and the surviving associate shall forward them at the safest opportunity, in order that from there they may be delivered to the síndico."[49]

Hence, far from regretting their removal from the management of the temporal affairs of the missions, Fr. Durán and his friars appear to have submitted quite philosophically to the confiscation of the movable and immovable property. Though

---

[46] De la Guerra had acted as síndico or depositary, who provided for the temporal needs of the friars, since about the year 1821. The same practice is still observed, because the individual friar can have no money or property of his own. His needs are provided from the funds deposited for him or the community with the síndico by the benefactors.

[47] This shows that Fr. Durán expected to be released along with the other friars, possibly through the substitution of secular priests.

[48] There was little likelihood that any of the friars would accumulate a large amount of money, but Fr. Durán thought it well to remind them of their Rules in view of the extraordinary circumstances surrounding them.

[49] Fr. Durán, "Circular," March 9th, 1835. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

they clearly foresaw that the change would be productive of grave evils, and though they keenly felt the spiritual and temporal damage which the Indians must necessarily suffer in consequence, they also were convinced that they had done all they could to ward off such disaster from their neophytes. They could look back upon their efforts with no small degree of satisfaction, inasmuch as they had accomplished, as far as lay in them, the task which they had been sent to undertake, and that, too, despite the opposing forces of one kind or the other which from the inception of the work in 1769 to the end of 1834 had incessantly obstructed their endeavors for the Christianization and civilization of the savages. The friars had brought the truths of the Gospel and the means of salvation to as many as 86,000 natives, of whom about 66,000 by death had already gone beyond the reach of perversion,[50] leaving still about 17,000 neophytes under the spiritual care of the twenty-seven [51] surviving missionaries. They had at the same time induced the indolent natives to acquire a knowledge of many mechanical arts, besides cultivating the soil and raising live-stock. In the meantime, with one solitary exception, these religious had not forgotten their sanctification which was really their personal aim whilst they attended to the Master's work.

In truth, Fr. Durán and the other friars rather rejoiced at the prospect of relief from the burden which was so foreign to their tastes and personal aspirations, and which they had only shouldered for the sake of the poor natives; nay they awaited the execution of the decrees with a certain degree of impatience, as is evident from Fr. Durán's letter to the governor of July 22nd, 1834, already quoted, in which he says, "I do not know what to think about it. It will soon be a

[50] Exact figures will be found in the local history. See Appendix J.

[51] Seventeen Fernandinos and ten Zacatecanos. Most of the former were old and infirm. "I am beginning to feel a scarcity of able-bodied religious, and now I shall have no one at my disposal. From among the aged, lame and crippled there is little use to make a selection." Fr. Durán to Governor Figueroa, July 22nd, 1834. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2182.

year since the law passed, and as yet we do not see a beginning made of putting it into practice."[52]

Similarly the Zacatecan Fathers under Fr. García Diego in the northern California missions displayed a total absence of attachment to the control of the temporalities, though the evidence is not so patent as in the case of the Fernandinos under Fr. Durán. This is owing to the lack of documents, which become scarcer with every year. The Fr. Guardian of the Zacatecas College, however, when forwarding a copy of the Mexican secularization law of August 17th, 1833, congratulated Fr. García Diego and his nine companions. He directed them to comply with the regulations concerning the transfer of the missions to secular priests, and at their arrival to retire to the College.[53]

We should find it strange if the bibulous Alvarado had not dreamed something in this connection and given it out as a solemn fact. He accordingly tells us that the Zacatecanos were in a fury; that they prepared a protest to the Mexican President against the plundering policy of Governor Figueroa, and asked for the trial and removal of the governor; that, backed by Zamorano and Sánchez, they sent the protest south for the signatures of the Fernandinos; that not one of them would sign the document, and that some even talked warmly in favor of Figueroa's Reglamento confiscating the missions, mainly to annoy the Zacatecanos, whom they despised as intruders. All this is additional proof of Alvarado's malevolence. Bancroft himself remarks, *"I believe there is no reason to credit Alvarado's statements on this and like subjects."*[54]

---

[52] "Archb. Arch.," no. 2182.

[53] Fr. García Diego, "Circulars," May 23rd, June 20th, 1834. Libro de Patentes, Mission San José.

[54] Bancroft, iii, 347. Italics are ours.

CHAPTER XV.

The Old Story.—Missions Must Furnish Supplies As Ever.—Figueroa to Fr. Durán.—Specimen Demands.—Slanders of the Paisano Chiefs.—Vallejo's Absurd Charges.—Claim of Wholesale Slaughter.—Fathers Disheartened.—Pico's Suppression of Real Reason for the Decay.—Some Stipends for the Friars.—The Pious Fund.—How the Government Misused It.—Figueroa's Ungracious Recommendations.—His Report.—His Fanaticism.—The Majority of the People with the Friars.

ONE of the reasons why the missionaries sighed for deliverance from the management of the missions was the prospect of not having any more to burden the poor neophytes, who remained loyal, with work merely to satisfy the importunities of the troops. The friars, it appears, had never succeeded in convincing these leeches [1] that they and their convert Indians were straining every nerve to furnish the supplies demanded without ruining the missionary establishments. On the contrary, the enemies as maliciously as untruthfully persisted in accusing the Fathers of unwillingness to aid the "brave defenders of the country" in order to hoard up wealth for themselves and lead lives of ease and luxury!

It must be remembered that the Mexican Government still failed to provide for the soldiery and the needs of the territory. As late, therefore, as April 30th, 1834, even while he was planning his wicked Reglamento of confiscation, which removed the missionaries from control and left the neophytes at the mercy of hirelings, Governor Figueroa appealed to Fr. Durán as follows: "The extreme need in which I am by reason of the lack of means with which to pay for the support

[1] Mariano Vallejo confesses to as much as "$20,000, which we the members of the Diputacion, together with other prominent citizens, obtained (extorted?) from Fr. José Sánchez of Mission San Gabriel to facilitate the payment of the expenses of a military force destitute of everything at the time." "Speech," October 8th, 1876. "Our Centennial," page 120. Fr. Sánchez ceased to be presidente in 1831.

of the troops, who have not received any pay for the last twenty years, compels me to take steps which I would otherwise gladly avoid. They are having a wretched and exasperating existence, and even this has to be made possible by begging from the missions because the revenues do not cover the fourth part of the expenses.[2] Here you have the reason why I so often must appeal to the missions. In order to regulate the matter so that you may know in advance what you are to contribute, I have formed an estimate of what is indispensable for the troops of Santa Barbara and San Diego, and I forward it to you so that you may tax the missions proportionately. Please, Your Reverence, make an heroic effort for the common good, and for the tranquillity of the territory, until the Supreme Government is enabled to remedy this, as I so often have supplicated.[3]

"You will observe that I beg for a loan [4] of cattle and implements. This is for the purpose of establishing national ranchos,[5] which are to help defray the expenses, and to relieve the missions of such a burden.[6] I ask for hides, rifle

[2] So the missions actually supplied three-fourths of the amount needed, not counting their share of the taxes and custom duties!

[3] For twenty-three years the Fathers were making heroic efforts, and they taxed their respective missions in order to tranquillize the soldiers, who were really the only ones that caused disturbance either through their outrages on the natives or through their bad example.

[4] That was the usual title under which the missions had supplied nearly a million dollars' worth of provisions and goods. Nothing was refunded. What wonder if the mission buildings, etc., were doomed to decay?

[5] Such ranches had been planned and begun since the last decade of the eighteenth century. All failed. This fact is additional proof that the friars managed in a business-like manner and conscientiously, for even in a material sense the missions succeeded wonderfully, and the territory was actually living upon them. Whence then the persecution of the missionaries? They wore a religious habit, and solicitously defended the rights of their Indian wards against white cupidity.

[6] Nevertheless, at this very period the ungrateful Figueroa was devising means to make the missions bear the additional load of salaries for hired administrators who were to supplant the unsalaried and faithful missionaries!

cases, trappings, horses, etc., articles of which the troops stand in need, and without which it is impossible to undertake any expeditions, so as not to stay at home as now they are bound to do. Hence occur the insolence of the savages and the frequent robberies to the detriment of the missions as well as of the white settlements. Likewise I ask for fifty loads of flour to make certain kinds of biscuits needed on the expeditions. Finally, I ask for oxen and implements for cultivation in order to raise something for the support of the soldiery."[7] Of course, Fr. Durán urged the Fathers to comply as well as possible, though this meant subjecting the poor neophytes to additional hardship for which they received little or no acknowledgment from the troops, who regarded the missions as their milch cow, so to speak, and as their legitimate prey.

Here from the *California Archives* are some specimen orders for helping the troops in the previous year of 1833. On February 21st "Fr. Narciso Durán is requested to command the missions of the San Francisco jurisdiction[8] to furnish for four or six months all the grain which the garrison of Monterey consumes, calculating fifty fanégas of corn and twenty fanégas of beans, besides forty-five arróbas[9] of mantéca a month."[10] In reply Fr. Durán, March 2nd, wrote that the following supplies had been forwarded: One hundred fanégas of maize, fifty-two fanégas of horse-beans in the pod, fifteen fanégas of peas, ten fanégas of beans, and for His Honor, the Governor, one fanéga of beans, three fanégas of garbanzos or chick-peas, two hundred and twenty-five lbs. of fancy flour, and six strings of chile.[11]

---

[7] Figueroa to Fr. Durán, April 30th, 1834. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2169.

[8] Missions San Francisco, Santa Clara, San José, San Rafael, Solano.

[9] An arróba was equal to twenty-five lbs.; a fanéga equaled a hundredweight, or as Forbes calculates, two and one-half English bushels.

[10] "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Benicia lxxix, p. 49.

[11] "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Benicia lxxix, p. 50.

In the far south, omitting similar demands elsewhere, we find Comandante Santiago Argüello of San Diego, March 2nd and 9th, 1833, requesting Fr. Antonio Ánzar of San Luis Rey to furnish more supplies. We shall not wonder at the response, if we bear in mind that Echeandía and his band had afflicted this mission previously for many years. Fr. Ánzar, March 3rd, wrote: "Muleteer Joaquin leaves here to take grain from the mission to the presidio of San Diego. He brings sixteen fanégas of wheat, but no beans, for there are none even for planting, nor any peas, mantéca, soap, or tallow. There is not even an ounce of anything."[12]

Notwithstanding that the missionaries and their neophytes labored hard to satisfy the governor and his troops, they were at this very time slandered unmercifully by the *paisano* chiefs, who feared lest even a part of the coveted booty might escape their grasp. They accused the aged friars, some of whom could barely keep on their feet on account of their infirmities, of wilfully neglecting, nay, wantonly destroying the mission property as soon as they learned that the management would be taken from them.[13] When we remember that, besides holding themselves accountable to Almighty God for the culpable waste of anything belonging to the missions, the Fathers had sunk into the mission fund all their personal earnings, such as stipends and alms, in order to rear and maintain the Indian mission establishments, we can imagine how this wicked charge must have affected the venerable old men, and what must have been the character of the creatures who dared broach such an accusation. The truth is, in trying to blacken

---

[12] "No hay ni un adarme de nada."—"Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Benicia, lxxix, 88-94. Fr. Oliva, who succeeded Fr. Ánzar, on April 16th, 1833, notified Argüello that he had only one hundred fanégas of wheat at Las Flores instead of 1000, and that he could not furnish the supplies demanded. Ibidem, p. 260. Figueroa himself, May 10th, 1833, asked Fr. García Diego for more provisions. Ibidem, 52-55. See also chapter ix, this section.

[13] Of course their lying clamors were only raised to offer excuses for the contemplated wholesale robbery. Unfortunately, most writers allowed themselves to be deceived, and they have retailed the calumnies as undeniable facts ever since.

the fair name of the poor friars the conspirators against the missions exposed to view their own aspirations and methods.

Mariano Vallejo for instance, publicly made this wild statement as late as the year 1876: "When the old missionaries saw that the political tornado[14] was about to burst upon the mission system, they commenced to convert into money all their movable property, such as cattle and stock.[15] . . . The pecuniary wealth of the missions in their primitive days was sent out of the country to Spain, or Mexico, or Italy. This I know, and presume,[16] and believe, that all of it arrived safely at its place of destination.[17] It would have been well for the old sinner's reputation if he had cited only one instance. There is not a shred of evidence for his assertions. We know, on the contrary, that not as much as a dollar of mission money, or a dollar's worth of mission goods, was ever sent out to these or any other countries by the friars directly or indirectly, either for their relatives or for their brethren in the Order or for the Church anywhere. At all events, the burden of the proof rests upon the accusers, but the so-called Californians never presented a single instance of abuse of mission property on the part of the Franciscan friars. Says Forbes, who cannot be accused of partiality for the missionaries, "I have never heard that the missionaries of California have not acted with the most perfect fidelity, or that they ever betrayed their trust."[18]

Furthermore, every sense of justice and decency blunted by their cupidity, the Picos, Bandinis, Ósios, Vallejos, etc., accused

---

[14] It consisted only of the bellowing greed of such as Vallejo.

[15] The friars never claimed such property. Why does Vallejo make it appear that the missionaries accumulated anything for themselves?

[16] He presumes! That was all the proof he could produce.

[17] "Speech" at the Centennial, October 8th, 1876. "Our Centennial," 120. The bold Muenchhausen of California has much to answer for, but this piece of audacious lying is one of his worst offenses.

[18] Forbes, "California," 227. The author was a contemporary who lived at Tepic, near San Blas, where the Fathers stopped on going to or leaving California.

the friars of inaugurating a wholesale slaughter of cattle in order to spite their enemies. "Such is the charge," says Bancroft, "and though exaggerated in detail, I have no doubt it is well founded." It would have been more honorable for Bancroft if he had brought to bear some substantial proof that the charge was well founded; for a few lines further down he acknowledges that *"the documentary evidence on this subject is slight"*; but, he says, "so far as I know, the padres have left in the records no denial of its truth."[19] Strange argument! One should think that the enemies could have adduced such abundant proof of the "wholesale slaughter" that Bancroft would not have been compelled to call it *slight*. If the Californians failed to prove their accusations, why should the Fathers feel called upon to deny it, when from experience they knew that denials were of no avail with their greedy adversaries? There is conclusive testimony in the official report of the status of every mission for every year of missionary control. From them it is clear that no such wholesale slaughter could have taken place without the knowledge of the governor. Yet the governor found no evidence outside the charges of the covetous enemies. Moreover, the Fathers could point to their whole history as managers of the property from the time of Fr. Serra. Abuse of property, such as the mission enemies were guilty of when they obtained control, was something that could not be said of the scrupulously faithful friars. To this day the account books and their annual reports show how minutely they noted everything down in the way of loss or gain. Naturally such malignity on the part of the *paisano* ingrates broke the spirits of the aged friars, who were conscious of having served and slaved for the temporal and spiritual salvation of the Indians with absolute forgetfulness of their own necessities and comfort.[20] It

[19] Bancroft, iii, 349. See Appendix K.

[20] Agreeably to their Rule, not one so far had laid away anything for a "rainy day." Had they been ordered out of the territory, they could not have paid their passage even as far as Mexico. Even Fathers Peiri and Cabot had to ask the governor for means to pay their travelling expenses, and they took away no more than he allowed them.

was with a sense of relief, then, that the missionaries yielded the management of the missions to the hirelings appointed by the governor at the behest of his mercenary counselors. Hence, too, it is, as Bancroft complains, that the documents extant relate so little of what occurred at the time of the confiscation.

Later, when blamed for the general ruin of the mission property after the confiscation, Pio Pico claimed that the priests had permitted the ruin to seize the missions long before that act; and that at the time the missions were delivered to the administrators the inventories and witnesses showed that the cattle were few and scattered, the fences down, the gardens destroyed, the shops and machinery useless and covered with dust and cobwebs.[21] This was partially true, but the wily Pico suppressed the causes of this decay. He should have confessed that it was the result first of the extortions practiced by the military upon the missionaries, who were thus compelled to neglect improvements in order to produce the articles and provisions incessantly demanded. Another cause was the insubordination of the neophytes which came about through the interference of Echeandía, Pico, and their confederates since the year 1826. These worthies had belabored the Indians for being faithful to the missionaries,[22] and for not using the liberty which the Mexican Republic and its representatives in California offered them. Able-bodied neophytes in large numbers had thereupon run away or refused to do the work that was necessary to keep the missions in a flourishing condition. The consequences could be seen at Mission Luis Obispo, for instance. As early as December 31st, 1830, good Fr. Gil reported: "The mission is in a bad state. The hospital and part of the ranchería [23] are in ruins; the rest of the ranchería is threatened with ruin. The ranch and buildings of San Miguelito are destroyed. The front of the mission church is threatening to fall. Only the granary, the dwelling of the missionary, two or three Indian houses, and

[21] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Missions xi.

[22] See note 32, chapter xviii, section i, this volume.

[23] The village of the neophytes near the church.

the walls most in danger of falling have been repaired. *As there are so few hands* (many, not to say most, old people and the infirm look with coldness on work), I do not dare to guarantee any rebuilding, nor even any repairing of buildings, because even for planting and harvesting, which is most necessary, we see ourselves in want of laborers."[24]

This state of things then was the direct result of the intrigues of the mission enemies who had cast covetous eyes on the property of the Indians since the arrival of Echeandía.

Meanwhile, by submitting to heavy discounts, some of the friars seem to have succeeded in recovering a portion of the stipends due them from the Pious Fund for the year 1834. This was accomplished through the German merchant Henry Virmond (Wehrmund), who for approved missionary drafts on the Pious Fund obtained others on the national treasury which were paid in custom-house orders negotiable at twenty-five or thirty per cent. discount for cash. As usual, at this period the accounts are incomplete, says Bancroft, and it is impossible to state exactly what sums were obtained; but at one time, according to Figueroa,[25] $7,200 were paid to the Fathers of six missions; "and the College of San Fernando seems to have had a bill accepted for the stipends of nine missionaries from the beginning of 1830 to the respective dates of their decease."[26] Two or more missions suffered the loss of the stipends through the insolvency of Síndico Martiarena at Tepíc. On October 14th, 1834, the directors of the Pious Fund in Mexico called for certified accounts of sums due the individual missionaries. The College returned a list of California Fathers which showed the sums due for stipends at $400 a year from 1811 to December 31st, 1834, to be $248,000. The amount received from 1811 to 1830 by missionaries

[24] Fr. Gil y Taboada, "Informe," December 31st, 1830. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Further evidence of this kind will be found in the local history.

[25] "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Col. ii, 453-454; Bancroft, iii, 350.

[26] Bancroft, iii, 350. These Fathers were, Catalá, Suñer, Boscana, Barona, Amorós, Sánchez, Gil, Uria, and Sarriá. The last-named was also the last of the number to pass away. He died in 1835.

still living in 1834 was $19,200, whereas $45,600 should have been paid for them to the Fr. Procurator in Mexico.[27] It will be remembered that the missionaries never received money, but the Fr. Procurator would purchase with it such goods and articles as the Fathers in California desired.

With regard to the Pious Fund Estates, instead of being rented out for a term of seven years and the proceeds deposited in the mint of the Federal City to be solely and exclusively destined for the missions of the Californias, as directed by the law of May 25th, 1832,[28] they remained in the hands of a Board of Control. Of the revenues, which were due to the missions of Upper and Lower California from June 1832 to March 1834, amounting to $56,250, the Supreme Government expended the sum of $25,691 *on the colonizing scheme of Padrés and Híjar;*[29] $23,567 the same Government seized as a forced loan; and only $1,523 were doled out to the missionaries as a part of their stipends.[30] That explains why the friars received so little from the Pious Fund even when it was producing a sufficient revenue.

Nevertheless, though with the $7,200 mentioned in a previous paragraph the Mexican Government paid only a small part of the arrears due the missionaries, Governor Figueroa objected to the tardy remittance of such a small part of what was due in justice. Referring to the payment of that sum to the Fathers of Missions San Antonio, Santa Inés, Purisima, San Miguel, San Juan Capistrano, and San Francisco for the years 1831 and 1832, Figueroa ungraciously advised the Secretary of State to suspend the payment of such stipends on the ground that the Fathers managed the missions in their

---

[27] Bancroft, iii, 350-351.

[28] "Articulo 6. Los productos de estos bienes (fundo piadoso) se depositarán en la casa de moneda de la ciudad Federal, para destinarlos unica y precisamente á las misiones de Californias."—"The Pious Fund of the Californias," Washington 1903, p. 205; 308; Dwinelle, p. 46, par. 65.

[29] The Mexican Government thus had little regard for the will of the testators who wanted this money to be used for the missions only.

[30] Bancroft, iii, 350.

own way and had plenty of resources. In case of actual necessity the stipend could be paid from the mission products,[31] and the whole considered as a loan to the Government.[32]

Waiving Bancroft's remark that, "in view of the secularization laws already enforced or to be enforced, the meaning and force of Figueroa's argument are not apparent," [33] why should the high-salaried governor begrudge the aged missionaries a little pin-money, so to speak, with which to procure sundry gifts for the Indians? Why should he want to deprive them of the church goods and other articles, which were procured with such extra funds, without having to fall back upon the resources of the missions in California suffering too much already from the everlasting demands of the same governor and his shiftless troops? These stipends were due the missionaries in virtue of former royal and present Mexican governmental dispositions in accord with the intentions of the donors of the Pious Fund whence the said allowance was derived. How, after all, did it concern the governor if the friars received what was coming to them? They were not his slaves nor his servants that he, with a salary of $4,000, should grudge them the pittance of nominally $400 in merchandise, minus the freight charges all the way from Mexico, or in cash minus the discount of twenty-five or more per cent. For learning and executive ability those venerable men were not one whit inferior to him, even though for a higher motive they chose to wear a poor religious garb instead of a glittering uniform. Bancroft is right in saying that the force of Figueroa's argument is not apparent. The historian, however, forgets that these friars happened to be Spaniards and members of a monastic Order,

[31] But these did not suffice to satisfy the demands of the troops!

[32] A forced contribution rather, for no such loans were ever refunded. Figueroa to Secretary of State, May 2nd, 1835. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Colon. ii, 453-454; Bancroft, iii, 350-351. Figueroa at that time stood on the brink of the grave. He died only three months later.

[33] Bancroft, iii, 350-351.

which Figueroa, though he affected a diluted Catholicity, or because of it, despised. Hence the churlishness of the governor.

Lest the reader suppose that we misjudge Figueroa, we herewith reproduce a letter which he in January 1834 addressed to the Secretary of State in reply to a request for information regarding Fathers Durán and Sarriá, who had been singled out for expulsion because their cradles had happened to stand in Spain. "It is evident," the governor wrote, "that *the private and religious conduct of these priests is exemplary;* that they have virtues which are not common, and talent and learning for the discharge of their sacred ministry. They are on this account worthy of esteem and respect, and they do enjoy an honorable reputation;[34] but with regard to their political conduct I must say with regret that it is not befitting the national interests. These two religious have discharged the office of Superior, so that their political opinions have influenced all from their College; hence, I speak of them all in general.

"They publicly refused to take the oath on the Federal Constitution, although they protested that they would obey it. It is true that some[35] took the Oath of Independence, but they are not in accord with it; for they believe that they must in conscience not be untrue to their fidelity to the King of Spain. Consequently they will never acknowledge our independence to be of right, and so they constantly refuse any sign of approbation. For that reason they celebrate none of our national festivities, nor do they take part in them when they are invited by the authorities.[36] For that reason they

[34] "Es evidente que la conducta privada y religiosa, que han observado estos sacerdotes es ejemplar; que tienen virtudes no comunes, talento é instruccion para el desempeño de su ministerio sagrado. Son por este motivo dignos de aprecio y respecto, y gozan de una reputacion honrosa."

[35] All swore to the independence. See chap. ix, sect. 1, this volume.

[36] Figueroa expected the friars to rejoice over their own annihilation, for this was decreed by the Mexican politicians when they determined to dissolve religious communities and expel all Spanish religious.

disapprove the allotment of public lands,[37] and every action [38] emanating from the exercise of the Supreme Authority. They have been unguarded in preaching against this political dogma, inasmuch as they deny that the supreme power resides in the people.[39] They contend against the liberty of the press, and firmly attribute to it the relaxation of morals.[40] They advocate the re-establishment of the Inquisition, because they say that it is owing to its absence that impiety has been propagated.[41]

"This, it seems to me, is a schism which directly attacks some of the groundworks of our Constitution, and, if you will,

---

[37] They opposed the allotment of Indian lands to shiftless settlers and white adventurers; and they disapproved the distribution of mission lands in severalty to neophytes as premature and destructive. In both cases they were right. See Appendix G.

[38] Figueroa in his illness grew captious. The friars obeyed every action of either the territorial or General Government when such action demanded nothing contrary to God's law. With that every reasonable government would be satisfied.

[39] This "political dogma" may be appropriately styled an invention of demagogues, who preach it not to promote the welfare of the people, but to advance their own selfish interests. Even under a well organized and representative government, which the Mexican was not, the people have no other power in the matter than to designate the persons who shall exercise authority. Those so designated must then be obeyed in their sphere as representatives of God; for "there is no power except from God, and those that are, are ordained by God." (Rom. xiii, 1.) This was the doctrine which the missionaries preached when they touched the subject at all. Such doctrine displeases unscrupulous politicians only, because they do not want to feel themselves accountable to God.

[40] A licentious press being understood, the Fathers were right, for the dissemination of vile literature did then, as it does now, corrupt morals and destroy Religion. The paisano chiefs of that time were living evidences.

[41] The Inquisition in California confined itself to preventing the spread of vile and irreligious literature. On beholding the damage wrought, the Fathers naturally wished that some such police authority existed. The U. S. Postal authorities are attending to this matter with wholesome effect among us. See Appendix E.

it is an insult to the nation.[42] If to the influence, which through their ministry they exercise over the common people, we add that which the possession of wealth they manage gives them we must be convinced that they are dangerous persons in case of an invasion,[43] notwithstanding that in all else they obey the government, assist it and procure the conservation of order and peace, and cooperate with all their means and influence.[44]

"For these and many other reasons I am of the opinion that they ought to leave the republic, as well as the said Fr. Narciso Durán, who is the presidente and prefect, and Fr. Vicente Sarría, as the rest of the friars who are in the same position. At the same time, however, it is expedient to have others fill their places previously, in order to avoid the murmuring of the incautious and the consequences of stupid fanaticism. Some consideration must also be had for those very much advanced in age, on account of the many and good services which they bestowed upon these missions, and for the infirm, of whom there are several who are entirely useless. God and Liberty.[45] Monterey, January 17th, 1834." [46]

---

[42] The whole Gospel was and is treated by Mexican "Liberals" as though it were an insult to the Mexican nation. The secular priest who should appear in the street in his cassock or in surplice, the friar who should dare to go out in his habit, are jailed and fined! Yet, nowhere the anti-Christian "Liberals" prate so much about liberty.

[43] It is scarcely possible that Figueroa here wrote sincerely. It was intended for effect, a speech to the "gallery," so to speak.

[44] How such persons could then be declared dangerous is a mystery. They were dangerous to Satan and his agents only. The friars had rescued about 86,000 souls from the clutches of Satan. It is this that explains why he, and those who make common cause with him, hated the missionaries so intensely.

[45] After such an exhibition of irreligious fanaticism to shout: "God and Liberty!" as was cunningly prescribed for a blind by the politicians of Mexico, sounds like blasphemy and mockery; for neither God nor true liberty was consulted in their transactions.

[46] "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. iii, 551-554. Compare this report of Figueroa with the letter of Fr. Durán at the beginning of this chapter.

As usual in Latin countries, so also the great mass of the people in California, as well as the English and American settlers, were with the missionaries. Only a handful of loud-mouthed demagogues, inexperienced youths at that,[47] wanted the religious driven out of the territory. The reason has been stated elsewhere, and it lay at the bottom of the scheme for the confiscation of the missions. This devotion of the law-abiding people for the friars "liberal" politicians like Figueroa, Echeandía, and the young California chiefs, called fanaticism, whereas it was but the grateful recognition of honesty, sincerity, and all-round virtue. On the other hand, it was real, unreasoning fanaticism to insist on removing the priests, after confessing that they were men of true virtue, who obey the government, and help to conserve peace and order, and to insist on the removal for no other reason than that these victims of such fanaticism were members of an approved Catholic religious Order, and natives of another though kindred land. We should wonder how the Apostles would have fared with these political fanatics. Certainly no better than the friar-priests who established the missions of California. It is pleasant to note that, after all, Figueroa's recommendations were not executed. He himself soon stood before his Eternal Judge, whilst the friars, whom he wanted to banish, remained at their post.

[47] Youth itself, of course, is no disparagement if coupled with modest reserve; but when it signalizes itself by conceit, arrogance, and impudence, then it is an important circumstance in judging an act. It is therefore a matter of consequence to know that the ruin of California's most benevolent institutions was not brought about through the mature judgment of staid, industrious, experienced and God-fearing men, but was the deed of conceited, indolent, insolent and irreligious youths. This throws a volume of clear light on the subject which it is necessary to keep in view, in order to understand the situation thoroughly at every phase of the period beginning with the arrival of Echeandía.

CHAPTER XVI.

Departure of Fr. Juan Cabot.—Death of Fathers F. X. Uría and Vicente de Sarriá.—Bancroft on Fr. Sarriá.—Manufacture of Wine.—An Amusing Episode.—Fr. Durán's Indignation.—Fr. Blas Ordáz Involved.—Fr. Blas Astray.—Explanation.—Politicians to Blame.—Fr. García Diego's Petition.—Humiliation of the Missionaries.—Figueroa and Divine Worship.—Result of the Comisionado System.—Fr. Quíjas's Terrible Indictment of Mariano Vallejo and Henchman Antonio Ortega.—Shocking State of Things at Mission San Francisco Solano.

FROM Figueroa's own description the Mexican Government seems to have concluded that the accused friars could not be very dangerous to the peace of the territory. At all events, it took no action. The missionaries were permitted to depart on their own account, or to die at their post, because it was found impossible to provide substitutes from the secular clergy. Only one of the Fernandinos, Fr. Juan Cabot, chose the former alternative. With the permission of the Fr. Presidente and the consent of the governor he sailed away in the fall of 1835. He had served at Mission San Miguel, with one interruption, 1819-1824, for twenty-one years. Like other Fathers he had saved nothing for himself, and therefore encountered difficulties in his efforts to secure enough money for the voyage to Spain. Some time previous William Hartnell, a merchant, had paid $808 for goods purchased from Mission San Miguel. For this amount Fr. Cabot petitioned the governor in consideration of his thirty years of gratuitous service in the California missions. According to Bancroft Figueroa allowed him one-half of the sum mentioned. This money, which equaled the stipends accorded the missionaries for one year's service, was all that the venerable missionary carried away from the mission. As it would hardly pay his passage to his native country, Síndico

José de la Guerra of Santa Barbara may have supplied the deficiency from the alms in his charge.[1]

Two missionaries, Fr. Francisco Xavier Uría of San Buenaventura and the saintly Ex-Prefecto Fr. Vicente Francisco de Sarriá of Soledad, were called to their eternal reward a short time before the departure of Fr. Cabot. Fr. Uría died at the home of José de la Guerra, Santa Barbara, on November 5th, 1834, when sixty-four years of age. Of these he had passed thirty-seven years in the missions of the territory.[2] Fr. Sarriá breathed his last at poor Soledad in the afternoon of Sunday, May 24th, 1835, at the age of sixty-eight years, of which he spent twenty-six years in the California missions. He was the first comisario prefecto, held the office twice, and was withal "one of the ablest, best, and most prominent of the Fernandinos," as Bancroft acknowledges.[3] It is therefore proper to devote some space right here to the memory of this remarkable friar rather than wait for the local annals. Bancroft's notes will answer the purpose for the present. Fr. Sarriá, says that historian, "proved himself as prelate the worthy successor of Serra, Lasuen, and Tapis. He was a scholarly, dignified, and amiable man; not prone to controversy, yet strong in argument, clear and earnest in the expression of his opinions; less disposed to asceticism [4] and bigotry [5] than some of the earlier Fernandinos, yet

---

[1] "Archivo de las Misiones, Papeles Originales," tom. ii, 819-820; 827-828, Bancroft Collection; Records of Mission San Miguel; Bancroft, "California," iii, 684.

[2] Libro de Entierros, Mission Santa Barbara.

[3] Vol. v, 712.

[4] Therein Bancroft errs. If any one of the friars was devoted to "asceticism," of which that historian has no conception, it was Fr. Sarriá. Without it the deceased could not have been the saintly religious all knew him to be.

[5] "Unreasoning" and obstinate attachment to one's belief! Only an unreasoning and obstinate materialist like Bancroft could predicate it of any Catholic religious or any Catholic; nor did intolerance enter into the make-up of the early friars, that is to say, intolerance of any but the vicious. The friars were just then suffering from the intolerance of so-called "Liberals" in Mexico, even as now in France and Portugal.

INDIANS CONVEY THE BODY OF FR. VICENTE FRANCISCO DE SARRIÁ TO SAN ANTONIO MISSION.

given at times to fasting and mortification of the flesh; devoted to his Faith and to his Order; strict in the observance and enforcement of Franciscan Rules, and conscientious in the performance of every duty; yet liberal in his views on ordinary matters, clear-headed in business affairs, and well liked by all who came in contact with him.[6] As prefect, no California friar could have done better, since in the misfortunes of his cloth he never lost either temper or courage. Declining as a loyal Spaniard to accept republicanism,[7] P. Sarriá was arrested in 1825, and his exile ordered; but his arrest, which lasted about five years, was merely nominal,[8] and the order of exile, though never withdrawn and several times renewed, was never enforced. He lived quietly at Soledad, which he declined to leave in 1834 when the northern missions were given up to the Zacatecanos, especially as no resident missionary was assigned to this mission. Thus he was the last of the Fernandinos in the north, dying just before the secularization which put an end to the Franciscan régime. He died suddenly without receiving the final Sacraments.[9] Padre Mercado declared that his violent death was due to the want of food, and the tradition became somewhat prevalent that he died through neglect of the administrator. I do not credit Mercado's charges, or believe that there was an administrator in California who would have maltreated a missionary so widely known and loved.[10] His body was car-

[6] "To have known the old Padre Sarriá was a happiness indeed." Robinson, "California," 90.

[7] the kind presented by the Mexican Liberals. This was not republicanism at all, but despotism.

[8] It prevented him from leaving Monterey and making the canonical visitations with evil consequences in one case, as we shall see presently.

[9] Fr. Mercado of San Antonio came too late.

[10] Missionaries did receive similar treatment at the hands of administrators, as Bancroft well knows and we shall prove in time. It would be singular if in this connection the doughty Mariano Vallejo had not vented his malice in some day-dream. Accordingly, he charges that Fr. Sarriá's death was caused by neglect on the part of the Mexican friars! (Bancroft, iii, 689.) What the Mexican or

ried to San Antonio and buried in the mission church, on the epistle side of the presbytery." [11]

Those interested in growing grapes and manufacturing wine will appreciate the following correspondence which speaks for itself. Fr. Presidente Durán, who but four months previous, on the arrival of Figueroa with the Zacatecan Fathers, had removed his headquarters from Mission San José to Santa Barbara, writing to the governor from San Gabriel says: "I have received your petition asking me about the manner of making claret, brandy, etc., which I am thinking of manufacturing at Santa Barbara.[12] There I expect to have more time and quiet than I enjoy in this Babylon, San Gabriel, where for want of a retired room I hardly find sufficient privacy to say my prayers.

"I have to remark in reply that I can say little or nothing certain about the muscatel, because there is none of it at Mission San José; nor do I know it. The wine of San Luis Rey in my opinion is not the best, nor the best suited to place before a friend. I think there are only two kinds: the red wine and the white wine. The latter, which is used for altar purposes, is rather unpleasant, because it has no sweetness whatever, but is very dry.

"The best wines which I have found in the various missions are those of San Gabriel. There are two kinds of red wine. One is dry, but very good for the table; the other is sweet, resembling the juice pressed from blackberries and so

---

Zacatecan friars had to do with Fr. Sarriá at Soledad is a puzzle which Don Mariano alone could solve, of course by means of another calumny. It is wonderful to what antics the California comisionados take refuge in order to cover their own wickedness.

[11] Bancroft, iii, 689-690; Libro de Entierros de San Antonio.

[12] It would, therefore, seem that before 1833 no brandy had been manufactured at Mission Santa Barbara, and most probably at no mission north of San Gabriel. As will appear at the close of Fr. Durán's letter, brandy was used to fortify the wine. (For other uses of the liquor see vol. ii, 576-577.) According to Roman decisions it is permissible to add brandy to poor, unadulterated altar wine, but such brandy must itself be the product of grapes, and the alcohol in the wine after the addition must not exceed twelve per cent., in extreme cases by all means not more than eighteen per cent.

rather unpleasant. There are also two kinds of white wine. One of them is from pure grapes without fermenting, I mean from pure grape juice without fermenting it with the skins of the pressed grapes. This produces the white wine. The other of the same juice is fermented with a quantity of grape brandy. These two make a most delicious drink for the dessert. The wine from the pure grape juice is for the altar; the other for any use whatever." [13]

An amusing episode, as Bancroft styles it, in which a friar had an unenviable share, must be noted here. The charge of conspiracy was raised against "those irreconcilable foes of the country, Captain José de la Guerra, Fr. Narciso Durán, Fr. Tomás Esténaga, and Sergeant José Antonio Pico." A special messenger on May 26th, 1834, brought letters of information to the governor from Angel Ramírez,[14] Antonio M. Lugo, and Fr. Blas Ordáz, the latter then stationed at San Buenaventura. Figueroa was notified that Fr. Durán and Don José de la Guerra had often ridiculed the federal government system, that mysterious papers had been signed, that a large amount of money had been transferred from San Gabriel to Santa Barbara, and that a soldier, José Romero, had been ordered by Pico to sign a paper without knowing its purport. The governor hastened to convene the legislative assembly in secret session in order to consider the momentous news. All the members were in favor of decisive measures. José Antonio and Carlos Carrillo were first sent south in order to use their influence to check an outbreak which might result from "ignorance and blind confidence in the Spanish friars." Numerous orders were despatched south to military officers, and troops were ordered from place to place. The governor determined to maintain the republican integrity of California, and Captain Gutiérrez was instructed to arrest the conspirators. In five days José A. Carrillo forwarded the soothing information that the charges were unfounded. Captain Gutiérrez somewhat later reported to the

[13] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, June 17th, 1833. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2140.

[14] Ramírez was an apostate friar of the Order of Our Lady of Ransom or Mercéd, Mexico. Bancroft, iii, 587-588.

same effect. Figueroa, thereupon, decided that the good name of those involved was not impaired. According to Robinson, De la Guerra had been negotiating for the purchase of a rancho. This had required a search of the archives of Santa Barbara, long conferences, and the signatures of several witnesses. An ignorant guard and the personal enmity of others had distorted the proceedings into a conspiracy, and thus caused the ludicrous commotion.[15]

Fr. Durán, however, took a serious view of the matter. He was not only the Superior of the missionaries, but as vicar to the Bishop of Sonora and California he was also the head of the Church in the territory. As such he could not quietly submit to trifling with his dignity on the part of those who acknowledged his spiritual authority. Some amends were due for so noisily questioning his loyalty on such trivial grounds. He appears to have sent to the governor an indignant protest. Figueroa seems to have thought Fr. Durán's resentment justified, for in a letter of July 7th, which like the Fr. Presidente's protest is not extant, sought to appease the Vicario Foraneo by some explanation or another. In a long reply Fr. Durán says: "Your Honor's esteemed letter of the 7th of this month, which I have just received, has brought back to my soul the peace which I had lost, and it has quieted the uneasiness which has worried me at the very altar like an importunate enemy. I am very grateful to Your Honor for having made it possible for me to say to you that, after I have spoken in my communications like a man with feelings, I now wish to speak as a Christian and as a religious. By this I mean that I regard what is past as past. I offer peace and ask it of any one who has declared himself my enemy. From Your Honor I ask nothing more than a generous pardon and indulgence in case some poor person should have to suffer on my account, I mean to say, if my calumniated innocence has given occasion for such action; for I suppose that Your Honor has

[15] Fr. Ordáz to Figueroa, May 20th, 1834; "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Benicia, lxxvii, 646; Leg. Rec. ii, 3-11; Ramírez to Figueroa, May 22nd; "Cal. Arch.," Prov. St. Pap., Ben., lxxvii, 643-645; Robinson, 165-166; Bancroft, iii, 257-258.

been convinced of it juridically. Let the whole past lie buried in the depths of the sea, as it were. If the Supreme Government, with which I must preserve agreeable relations, may have received unfavorable impressions of my incorruptible fidelity, I cannot but beg Your Honor to make some effort to dispel any such wrong impression, which it may have received to the loss of my reputation, to which, I think, I have a public right. . . ." [16]

Different was the case with one of the informers, Fr. Blas Ordáz. By accusing his ecclesiastical Superior before a secular tribunal he had incurred the severest censures. Governor Figueroa in his letter of July 7th seems to have interceded for the culprit, but the Fr. Presidente insisted that the guilty friar make the apology himself. "In this peace," he writes to the governor, "I include Fr. Blas; but in order that I may extend it externally, it is necessary that he should ask it of me humbly and sincerely. He will then find in me the mercy of a father. If, afterwards, I should be bound to reprimand him for his public conduct, I shall do so through Your Honor, inasmuch as your mediation, which commands respect, will be more effective than my authority; for the one aim, which I have always had in view, is his amendment." [17] When by July 22nd the guilty man had not offered the required satisfaction, the Fr. Presidente informed the governor that, unless it was forthcoming, he would do his duty according to the rules of Canon Law, because the culprit had incurred excommunication. If the governor pleased, he might avert the execution by using his influence with Fr. Ordáz.[18] The refusal of Fr. Antonio Jimeno of Santa Barbara to hear his confession, as Fr. Durán notes in the said letter to Figueroa, probably brought the stubborn friar to his senses; for on July 25th, Fr. Durán informed the governor that Fr. Blas had expressed his regret in writing, and that, in consideration of the promise to live as a

[16] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, July 12th, 1834. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2176.

[17] Ibidem.

[18] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, July 22nd, 1834. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2182.

religious should, the matter would now be regarded as dead and buried.[19]

Sad to relate, the motive for Fr. Blas's wicked action against his Superior was nothing less than a desire for revenge. Aided by the governor, the Fr. Presidente had removed him for misconduct[20] from Mission Santa Inés to Mission San Buenaventura, as soon as the arrival of the Zacatecan Fathers, early in 1833, had made it possible to station Fr. Joaquín Jimeno at Santa Inés. It was a year after his forced transfer to San Buenaventura that Fr. Ordáz displayed his resentment in the wicked manner just related. In the following year, 1835, he once more proved how one untamed passion will infallibly develop another, despite the religious habit or the priestly character. The Fr. Presidente desired Fr. Blas to take charge of Mission San Gabriel and San Fernando in order to relieve the two infirm and aged



Signature of Fr. Blas Ordáz.

Fathers Ibárra and Esténaga. In a flippant and highly insulting note Fr. Blas replied that he was tired of being cuffed, and should not be counted upon in affairs of that

---

[19] Fr. Durán to Figueroa. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2184.

[20] There is no direct documentary proof. Evidence rests on hearsay, but this sufficed to make Fr. Durán take action after due warning. A Friar Minor must avoid even the suspicion of evil, St. Francis commanded. Aside from some general terms of caution in a circular, and some ambiguous remarks in a letter of Fr. Durán to Figueroa, Fr. Blas's own flippant tone in replying to his Superior lent the most color to the accusation. Fr. Durán, "Circular," September 18th, 1831, in Libro de Patentes; Fr. Blas to Fr. Durán, July 18th, 1835; Fr. Durán to Figueroa, July 20th, 1835. "Archb. Arch.," nos. 2198 A & B.

nature.[21] This was rank disobedience, a thing unknown among the California missionaries. Again the Fr. Presidente was compelled to have recourse to the governor. The latter accordingly lectured the disobedient friar on his duty, and threatened to use force if he failed to respect and obey his Superior. This brought Fr. Blas to terms. He apologized, and although he pleaded ill-health, he expressed himself in the most humble manner.[22] For this reason Fr. Durán allowed him to continue at San Buenaventura until the spring of 1837, when he removed to Mission San Fernando.[23]

We need not go far in order to discover an explanation for this poor friar's temporary aberration. No canonical visitation had been held since the year 1821, when Fr. Commissary-Prefect Mariano Payéras made the rounds of the missions. Illness prevented the prescribed visit in 1823, and in the following year he passed away. When at length Fr. Sarriá in 1825 received his appointment to the office of comisario-prefecto, the hostile Echeandía appeared, and soon arrested him for refusing to swear allegiance to the anti-Christian Mexican republic. Although not confined in a dungeon, and not expelled as was intended, the nominal arrest prevented Fr. Sarriá from making the necessary visitations which he had introduced during his first term of six years.[24] When at last free to perform this chief duty of a comisario-prefecto, his term had expired and the Fathers had dwindled to one at each mission, in a few cases to two aged and exhausted missionaries. This circumstance, which alone im-

[21] "El P. Blasito está cansado de sufrir golpes, y no hay que contar con el para asuntos de esa naturaleza." Fr. Blas to Fr. Durán, July 18th, 1835. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2198A.

[22] Fr. Durán to Figueroa, July 20th; Figueroa to Fr. Blas, August 7th, 1835. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2198; "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. iii, 603-615; Leg. Rec. ii, 483-484. Fr. Blas to Fr. Durán, April 27th, 1836. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Los Angeles, City, p. 155.

[23] Records of Mission San Fernando.

[24] The presidentes before him had made regular visits, but he was the first to have such visitations formally entered in the mission books. The entries were signed by himself and countersigned by his secretary, a Father chosen to accompany him for that purpose. Thus we know he visited his charges in 1813, 1816, and 1818.

peratively called for his personal presence, barred Fr. Sarriá's successor, Fr. Durán of Mission San José, from attending to his chief duty until the arrival of Fr. García Diego with his Zacatecan friars; for he could find no substitute to take even temporary charge of the mission during his absence.

If under the most favorable conditions, as when two Fathers upheld each other, regular visitations were regarded as indispensable for preserving religious discipline and religious fervor, they became imperative when the subjects stood alone in a state of things such as prevailed under the rule of an Echeandía and his partisans. We can readily understand what would be the result in the civil or military service of the government, if the officials should lack the vigilant supervision of trusted inspectors. The friars in their Religion, in the Sacraments, and in the Rules of their Order, possessed an inexhaustible fountain of consolation and powerful incentives for the conscientious performance of their duties. Without these they could not have weathered the never-ending tempest of opposition, oppression, privations, and all manner of disheartening difficulties. Nor could they without them have escaped the universal contamination. Yet, being human, the periodical presence of a vigilant and sympathetic Superior would have smoothed the difficulties, removed temptations, revived zeal, and cheered their existence generally. That only one, in comparative youth, should have gone astray for a time after fully ten years of forced isolation at the most inland establishment, speaks well for the noble spirit which all other friars manifested during these trying times. Fr. Durán hastened to encourage his brethren as soon as he had removed his headquarters to Santa Barbara in 1833; this we learn from the mission records of that year.

Meanwhile administrators had been installed at the missions confiscated by Figueroa. The hirelings, who had been substituted for the unselfish missionaries, managed the remaining Indians and the temporalities according to their own notions, or the ideas of their covetous patrons, with the result that neither the Indians nor the missionaries could be satisfied. Especially in the northern establishments the Zaca-

tecan Fathers encountered many humiliating difficulties, which at length grew so intolerable that Fr. García Diego, the comisario-prefecto, went from Santa Clara to Santa Barbara in order to consult with Fr. Durán of the Fernandinos. The conference took place on May 27th, 1835, the eve of Ascension Day. The result was a memorial to the governor in which Fr. García Diego proposed certain changes in the management of the missions which were calculated to remove all cause for reasonable complaint. The suggestions are herewith reproduced in substance. 1. The quarters occupied by the missionary and his servants should be separated from the quarters of the administrators by a dividing wall. 2. The neophytes should be obliged to render to the missionary such personal service as might be necessary; and the missionary should be empowered not only to support, but also to correct his servants without interference from the administrator. 3. In view of the disorders resulting from the liberation of the single women and girls,[25] they should be restored to the exclusive supervision of the missionary who shall appoint an alcalde, whom he can trust, and who shall watch over them and render an account to the missionary of whatever he may observe. The alcalde shall be changed whenever the missionary deems it expedient. In case the missionary makes complaint of disorders the comisionado shall correct and chastise the guilty, except the very young girls over whom only the missionary and his alcalde shall have authority. 4. The $500 assigned for the expenses of Divine Worship shall be delivered to the missionary at the beginning of every year, because from this sum he must pay the sacristan, acolytes, bell-ringers, and musicians, besides paying for wax candles, altar wine, washing the altar linen, etc.[26]

---

[25] This result was foreseen by the missionaries. Nevertheless, Figueroa and his blind advisers insisted that all should be set "free," rather set adrift. Only libertines could be pleased.

[26] Figueroa in a circular to the administrators, dated December 27th, 1834, had declared this meagre allowance for church purposes excessive! "Que convencido el gobierno que es excesiva la cantidad de $500 señalada para el culto, como el maximum que se puede dedicar á dicho fin, y que los Padres la reciben invirtiendo ó no, ha

It would be too humiliating for the priest to have to approach the comisionado for every little thing. The missionary will keep an account book which is to be inspected by the prelate at the usual visitation. 5. The missionary should have some authority to enforce attendance at Divine Worship and the annual reception of the Sacraments. This was observed formerly, and such external coercion, as with children, is necessary with Indians, inasmuch as reasoning and persuasion as with white people would have no effect. 6. The administrators should be obliged to provide the means for traveling when the prelate must make his visits to the various missions; likewise for those Fathers who travel by order of their Superior. 7. The administrators should also furnish couriers for carrying the necessary mail.[27]

This petition throws much light on the humiliating position occupied by the missionaries after the confiscation of the establishments, which they or their predecessors had reared with their own means and labor and the labor of the neophytes. The situation must have greatly lowered the esteem of the Indians not only for the priesthood but for Religion itself. Fr. García Diego felt as much, and he tried to impress the governor with this injurious result to society itself; for he closes the document as follows: "In all this, Sir, no other

---

resuelto, que no se les entregue en lo succesivo sino aquello que les conste que debe invertirse precisamente en este objeto." ("Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Missions ix, 94-95.) That shows what little religion he possessed. Genuine Christians never find expenses for Divine Worship excessive. Their love and reverence for the Divine Majesty discovers ways to cut down, if necessary, other expenses lest Divine Worship suffer or those who maintain it. Figueroa and his kind could have learned some wholesome lessons from the pagans of old, let alone the example of the Israelites.

[27] Fr. García Diego, "Suplicas," May 29th, 1835. "Sta. Barb. Arch."; "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Col. ii, 540-542. Marginal note on the Santa Barbara copy by Fr. Durán, who however did not sign the document. Fr. García Diego presented it in his own name to the governor, when the latter in June arrived at Santa Barbara from a tour of inspection in the south, as per the Fr. Commissary's "Informe" of July 20th, 1836. "Sta. Barb. Arch." Figueroa was, of course, made aware that Fr. Durán concurred with Fr. García Diego.

object moved me than the welfare of souls, the peace, security, and tranquillity of this territory; for Your Honor must be aware that without Religion there are no morals, without morals there are no good manners, and without these society is impossible. Likewise it will be plain to Your Honor that, if the ministers are not respected, and have not the necessary subsistence, they become an object of depreciation to carnal people. Your Honor knows very well that our subsistence and support for Divine Worship must of divine right be furnished by the faithful; and that, if they do not supply it, we are not obliged to remain nor to attend them in spiritual matters." [28]

Nevertheless, as already stated, Figueroa, true to his "liberal" training, thought $500 expended annually for the honor of his God and Creator too much! He wanted the missions spared this outlay, or as much of it as possible. The said amount, indeed, and much more, under the "anti-monastic" system introduced by him, was consumed by superfluous administrators or comisionados; but that in his opinion was quite proper. However, as public worship could not be eliminated entirely, and some means had to be provided lest his system lose justification and he appear as persecutor of Religion, Figueroa devised another scheme. He resolved to establish ranchos at each mission for the support of the priest and the maintenance of public worship. The beginning was made at the missions of San Carlos and Santa Cruz. Believing that this arrangement would make the missionaries [29] independent of the already overbearing administrators, Fr. García Diego, in the petition just quoted, at first approved the project, and recommended its extension to all missions.

---

[28] Fr. García Diego, "Súplicas." See preceding reference.

[29] The Fr. Guardian of the Zacatecas College, June 15th, 1835, warned Fr. García Diego that the missions must not be considered nor called parishes, nor the missionaries termed curates, because no legal and formal transfer had been effected. Libro de Patentes, San José. The Fernandinos had received similar instructions. These establishments were accordingly never anything else than missions down to their sale by Pico in 1846, save a few that had been turned over to secular priests when the first bishop arrived.

Three months later he withdrew his approbation on the ground that such establishments, if ecclesiastical, would be against the Mexican laws, and would arouse new animosity among the enemies of the friars, since they before had antagonized the missionaries for having the management of property. Moreover, the Indians in their necessities would again flock to the missionaries, because they know that the Fathers love them. The consequence would be that soon there would be no means left for Divine Worship nor for the missionaries themselves. After all, the white people should not be dispensed from doing their duty towards Religion.[80] As Figueroa died but a short time later, the impracticable scheme was carried no further.

A complaint, however, which the same Fr. Comisario-Prefecto received a few days later from the missionary of San Francisco Solano, more than ever caused him to sigh for the discovery of some means that would free his brethren from unworthy subjection to unfriendly administrators and mayordomos. This letter is reproduced here entire for the reason that it graphically pictures the situation into which the neophytes and their missionaries had been thrust by means of the act miscalled "secularization." The conditions were bad enough, though perhaps not so bad at all other missions; but, inasmuch as Mission San Francisco Solano had been delivered to the tender mercy of Mariano Vallejo, who everlastingly, and louder than any one, held up the Franciscan Fathers as tyrants and the neophytes under them as slaves, it is quite proper to single out his methods at the establishment under his control as a specimen of the system forced upon the unhappy Indians by the *paisano* chiefs. Details on the treatment of the friars and neophytes of other missions will be described in the local annals.

"Very Rev. Fr. Comisario Francisco García Diego.

"San Rafael, August 2nd, 1835.

"My very esteemed Prelate, Father and Superior:

"I did not mean to open my lips for any complaint whatever concerning the things inflicted upon me, but as day

[80] Fr. García Diego to Figueroa, August 3rd, 1835. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Col. ii, 545-548.

after day grievances are multiplying, and even developing into public anti-religious and indecent acts, I cannot but lay before Your Paternity some incidents which, if I should allow them to pass in silence, would burden my conscience, and I should not comply with the duties of my ministry.

"Almost from the very day when the administration of the spiritual and temporal affairs of Mission San Francisco Solano was divided, there has been mute but continuous dissension, which, I believe, has proceeded from the comisionados Guadalupe Vallejo, Antonio Ortega, and Salvador Vallejo;[31] from the first-named not in so blunt a manner, from the second with the greatest coarseness, incivility, and irreligion; from the third with boldness, insolence, and impudence.

"In order to inform Your Paternity the better, it will be necessary to begin at the time when I surrendered my charge. I had not yet made the transfer of the land or of its belongings, when they began to give orders to the mayordomo, laborers, etc., so that when on one occasion I told the mayordomo[32] to take out two yoke of oxen, he replied that the comisionado[33] had given orders not to obey me any more in anything I commanded in the future.[34] To avoid trouble I had to bear this and leave the matter as it was. The same happened concerning the property in the field, for he disposed of it as though he had already obtained control before I had made the transfer.

"The small launch, which I used with the consent of Your Paternity and the permit of the governor, who told me that I could keep it till he should determine otherwise, has in a

---

[31] He was the junior of his brother Mariano by six years. "A rough, hard-drinking, unprincipled fellow; often inhumanly cruel in his Indian warfare. He dictated some 'Notas Historicas' for my use, but his good qualities as a historian did not include truthfulness." Bancroft, v, 759. The last remark may be applied to all the paisano chiefs.

[32] the predecessor of Antonio Ortega.

[33] Mariano Vallejo.

[34] "que habia dado orden el comisionado para que en nada se obedeciese lo que yo en adelante mandase."

manner been taken away from me. At all events, I have not been considered worthy of being notified in the least regarding the many and continuous trips it is making. On the contrary, I am compelled to go around begging to let me have it when sometimes I need it. Then they loan it to me with bad grace.

"When the governor charged me to select some black colts, I informed him that I should like to take on account of my stipend about twelve horses or colts. He agreed to it; but as I deferred till after the transfer in order to avert slanderous talk, they have flatly refused to let me have them, notwithstanding that I asked for them as part payment of my allowance.

"The Honorable General [35] has given orders that the apartments should be divided, that three horses should be assigned for my use, and that work on the church should continue. Nothing of this has been executed. I have asked that the yard belonging to my house be divided, that four cows be given me on account of my allowance, and to the same account one cow a week for slaughter in order to have enough meat and fat to pay the expenses of the week, and also to derive some gain from the hide.[36] All these three requests have been refused; and if at some time the last was granted, Ortega told me it was as a favor from him. For being deprived of the yard and porch I am obliged to suffer not a little. It really seems as though I am living in a stranger's house, as everything is closed up and I am forced to have even my little reception room turned into a passage way so that whoever wills may go in and go out, because the ordinary passage way is continually closed. For this reason some disagreements have risen such as the following.

---

[35] This title Fr. Quijas applies to Figueroa throughout.

[36] A cow was valued at less than $5.00. Fr. Quijas had to provide for his servants; and with presents of meat he could gain access to the Indian heart. Doubtless, too, the Indians under such a system, now that heartless hirelings were in charge, would often approach hungry. In truth, the once governing missionaries were now in the position of dependent housewives with tyrannical, miserly husbands!

"I sent some one to ask Antonio Ortega for the key to the hallway in order to bring water and two sheep, and, since on the preceding day other reasons had turned up, I sent word to him as follows: 'that he should send me the key to the passage way; that if others allowed their apartments to serve as a passage for everybody I would not, because the hallway was for the common use of all who lived in the house, and more especially for those who like myself had something to say there; that he should obey or give orders to execute what pertained to him, because I was not in the mission to carry out the will and orders of every one.' For this message, Salvadór Vallejo,[37] (who, as I believe, has no other connection with the mission except that he is the brother of the comisionado), presumed to come to me with the greatest boldness and impudence. Reproaching me for sending such a message to Ortega, he raised his hand as if to strike me, uttered many shameless words, and pulled me by the sleeve of the habit as if he would defy me. If it had not been for the holy habit, and the sacred character of a priest which I though unworthily bear, I would not have gone very far for the reply.[38] However, I suffered it all, but in a dignified manner I reproved him to his face in somewhat strong words for his audacity and effrontery, and for his meddling with things that did not concern him.

"Yet all this is as nothing, and I have not even thought of complaining; but I am bound to do so by reason of the many and abominable deeds of Ortega who in an unbridled and barefaced manner has given free rein to the infamous vice of lust. He spares neither young girls nor married women or widows, neither heathen nor Christian, as is affirmed by the

[37] Salvadór then counted just twenty summers!

[38] To apply the sound thrashing which the young bully Salvadór deserved, and which Fr. Quíjas felt like administering, was beneath the dignity of the religious or priest; but the friars, notably the Fernandinos, tolerated such indignities far too meekly and thus emboldened the offenders. Fr. Durán, we know, disapproved of such silence. The priests owed it to their position and to their neophytes, that they resented and exposed unworthy treatment; for such assaults could not be regarded as mere personal insults which should be overlooked.

majority of the inhabitants of San Solano, soldiers as well as *paisanos* and neophytes, but especially by Sergeant Pablo Pacheco, Ignacio Azevedo, Nicolás Higuera, a number of carpenters and shoemakers, and other neophytes, men as well as women, who have told me personally, and even to Fr. Pérez they have related it." We do not dare translate what follows in the text, where Fr. Quíjas gives names and facts. In a footnote the student will find the story. Only the names are suppressed for the sake of the descendants of this monster's innocent victims.[39]

"One day, whilst Fr. Pérez was celebrating holy Mass, and I was reciting the Divine Office, the said Ortega talked in front of the military quarters with Nicolás Higuera, Nicolás Juárez, Jacinto García, Olívas and others. He told them, and I myself heard it, that fornication was not forbidden:[40] that formerly—[41] It would be necessary," Fr. Quíjas puts in here, "to write too much if I should relate all the obsceni-

[39] "El Sargento Pacheco entre otras muchas cosas, que refiere de Ortega, asegura que ha dicho que ha pasado revista general con todas las mas mugeres de San Solano, y que espera no se le ha de quedar una. Don Ignacio Azevedo refiere iguales acontecimientos, y añade el que de nadie se oculta, lo que se debe creer por el hecho siguiente: El neofito Castor y Juan Bautista Catit afirman que un dia forzó en la casa del gentil Zalampai á una gentila llamada N. N., muger del gentil N. N., y que esto fué tan publico que todas los mas supieron, y lo presenciaron muchos gentiles y Christianos. El Alcalde T. Carlos refiere haberlo visto en la posolera estar pecando con un nuevo Christiano llamado N. N., y tambien refiere otros hechos. Finalmente llameré, si se quiere, á muchas de las mugeres, como son, N., N., N., N., N., N., N., N., N., etc., y ellas referiran lo que por ellas mismas ha pasado, como lo han referido al Padre Pérez, y á mi algunas de estas, con el bien entendido que todas las mas han sido violentadas, y las que no han hecho extremo alguno, ha sido por el mucho miedo que le tienen, como sucedió con N. N."

[40] "que el fornicar no estaba prohibido." This is proof that he never heard of the Sixth Commandment, which is not possible, or that he, like many of his kind among the chief paisanos, had emancipated himself from the Commandments of God as well as from the Precepts of the Church. The lecherous scoundrel by no means stood alone. The local history will reveal more.

[41] "que el antes rogaba á las mugeres, mas ahora solamente les metia el hombro y las tumbaba."

ties that he makes use of in his speech whenever he gives orders or speaks to the neophytes. He not only utters them himself, but makes the neophytes repeat them, as Ignacio Azevedo relates, and I myself have heard. The following is a sample: He made a recent convert named Christóphoro first say 'Gracias á Dios!' and then he added something shameless [42]; he also told him that a man should know everything. In short, he has taught these poor people such bad words that many of them do not mention him among themselves in any other way than as—'That Fellow.'

"The narrative now takes another course. One day, after I had celebrated holy Mass, while the people were saying their private prayers as was customary, before they finished their devotions Ortega ordered them to stop and to go to work. I pretended not to have noticed it at the time, but this only emboldened him. On the 15th of last month, on which day began the Novena of San Francisco Solano, the patron saint of the mission (I had told him in advance on the preceding day that on the morrow the Novena would begin, and that I intended to finish early in the morning, so that the people might be ready to perform their work through the day), he assumed such an inconsiderate manner and was



Signature of Fr. José Lorenzo Quijas.

guilty of such want of respect and reverence that, just as I had concluded holy Mass and was about to kneel down to say the prayers of the Novena, he commanded all the Indians to go out of the church, thus leaving me alone with the two servers, the sacristan, Pablo Pacheco, and one woman. He thus prevented solemnizing the Novena as far as possible, as has always been the custom not only at this mission but

[42] "añadió una osadía" in this connection hardly means anything less.

in the whole Christian world for the honor of the holy patrons.[43]

"When I took him to task for this, he replied that it did not concern him whether the Indians prayed or not; that it was his business to make them work; that for this the government had placed him there;[44] that the Indians were free;[45] that nothing of this was binding upon the Indians with the exception of holy Mass on Sundays; and that if they went to church on work days it was because he would have it;[46] for even *Guadalupe Vallejo had warned him that, since the feast of San Solano was at hand it was likely that the Father would want to cause delay with his Novena, as he had done at Dolores; but that in such a case he should drive the Indians out to their work as soon as Mass was finished.* This in effect he did, notwithstanding that I concluded holy Mass and the Novena devotions *before six o'clock in the morning!*[47]

---

[43] Fr. Quíjas wrote in August. The feast of San Solano occurs on July 24th. A nine days' devotion formerly preceded the feast. The occasion was utilized to inculcate lessons of Religion and virtue, besides giving the neophytes an additional day of relaxation. Hence great preparations were made for the annual feast of the patron saint at all the missions. The Indians looked ahead to the festivities as do children now for the season of Christmas. Ortega, by order of Vallejo and on his own account, brutally spoiled this occasion of joy! Under the circumstances Fr. Quíjas confined himself to reciting a few additional prayers very early in the morning. Even this was tabooed by Vallejo, Ortega & Co.! It was work, work now; no prayers; no application for consolation from above; no diversion of a noble nature. Truly, the Fathers had worked effectively if the Indians could submit to such tyranny and not turn upon their tormentors.

[44] This was untrue; Ortega was an appointee of Mariano Vallejo alone. Bancroft, iii, 354.

[45] Only free to work, work; not to pray. They had not been told as much before the confiscation. The neophytes now were slaves indeed.

[46] The rule of the Fathers had been denounced as slavery by these young upstarts! No friar ever claimed such absolute control.

[47] "Que aun Guadalupe Vallejo le habia prevenido, que estando ya proxima la funcion de San Solano, era regular, que el Padre qui-

"From all this Your Paternity will understand the present situation in which the poor neophytes find themselves, of the religious, civil, and political training which they are receiving, and the harsh and merciless treatment which they suffer to such a degree that this has been the cause why the majority of the gentiles, who had come last year, has fled as well as many of the old Christians. I also believe that they will continue to run away if the treatment is not changed. These are facts upon which we cannot look with indifference, for, inasmuch as our chief aim is to increase the flock of Jesus Christ, this is not only frustrated, but even what has been gained is being destroyed. In fine, as I am not able to bear this any longer, I have resolved, with Your Paternity's consent, to withdraw to this Mission of San Rafael until Your Paternity succeeds in obtaining a remedy along the line of the following articles, subject to your approval." Fr. Quijas under ten heads then offers certain propositions which in his opinion would effect a decided improvement. Several of them had already been presented in Fr. García Diego's "Súplica," [48] and as no notice was taken by the government of any of them any way, it is unnecessary to reproduce them. The last one, however, demanded "that Antonio Ortega, the mayordomo, should be removed in punishment for his many abominable and scandalous misdeeds in the mission to the dishonor of the holy Religion of Jesus Christ. In case he is not removed, Your Paternity may hold for certain that I will not go back there, not even by force; for, even though others can witness all this with cold indifference, I am not of that class. I shall rather flee to my College than return there before everything has been entirely set aright. May Your Paternity be pleased to excuse my long letter, overlook my mistakes, and command me, your least subject and

---

siera enchinchar con su Novena como lo hizo en la de Dolores; que esto supuesto luego que se acabase la Misa, echase la gente á sus trabajos, como en efecto lo hizo á pesar de haber yo concluido Misa y Novena antes de las seis de la mañana." Yet this same Vallejo never tires of prating about liberty, about his sweetness towards Indians, and about the brutality of the missionaries!

[48] See note 27, this chapter.

son, who humbly kisses your hands. Fr. José Lorenzo Quíjas." [49]

Fr. García Diego on August 12th forwarded this terrible indictment of Vallejo and his henchman Ortega to Governor Figueroa with the remark that "the evils described therein demand of Your Honor the most effective remedy." [50] What the outcome was will be seen in the next chapter.

---

[49] Fr. Quíjas to Fr. García Diego, August 2nd, 1835. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Col. ii, 571-576.

[50] Ibidem, 571-572.

CHAPTER XVII.

Why Vallejo and Ortega Went Unpunished.—A Sample of Vallejo's Ungovernable Vanity and Audacious Falsehoods.—Fr. García Diego Protests Against Official Arrogance.—Beneficiaries of Mission Confiscation.—Los Angeles as Capital of California.—Elections.—Last Address of Figueroa.—Resigns.—His Last Will.—His Death and Funeral.—Resolutions of the Territorial Assembly.—What the Result Was.—Figueroa's Burial at Santa Barbara.—Fr. García Diego's Statement.—He Journeys to Mexico.

IT might be supposed that a report, such as Fr. Quíjas presented through Fr. Commissary García Diego, would have resulted in the immediate dismissal of the profligate Ortega as well as of his master Vallejo. Surely, those who everlastingly prated about wanting to free and benefit the Indians, would visit with swift punishment such crimes against their beloved fellow-citizens, the emancipated neophytes. Nothing of the kind followed in this case, at any rate. Two reasons may be assigned for the governor's inaction. He had but a short while before returned from the south broken down in health, and doubtless thoroughly discouraged at sight of the consequences of his "secularization" act. In this condition, and with the fate of Victoria still fresh in mind, he probably dreaded to cope with the clique of which Mariano Vallejo proved himself the most noisy. It was a poor excuse, but we have ere this learned that those who displayed such unlimited fearlessness in dealing with helpless priests and religious, are not at all as courageous in dealing with those who may injure physically or politically.

The other reason is not pleasant to state, but we see no alternative. The crimes of which Fr. Quíjas accused the shameless mayordomo of unfortunate Mission San Francisco Solano, in the eyes of those in control of California affairs at the time were not crimes at all, though they were such in the face of the Religion of whose influence these men had emancipated themselves. Figueroa would have had to condemn

himself, as well as many others in prominence, if he had removed Ortega who was only more brazen about his immorality.[1] Had Fr. Quíjas put more stress upon other things in the conduct of the Vallejo henchman, such as would have appealed to the governor, it is possible that his complaints would have received some consideration. This we may infer from Figueroa's action in another case reported some months previously from San Francisco, and which offers a glimpse of the comisionado treatment of Indians after the confiscation. We let Hittell relate the story. "About the beginning of 1835, José Joaquín Estudillo was commissioner of San Francisco de Asis and Pedro del Castillo[2] his associate. A quarrel arose between them; and, as was usual upon such occasions many facts came to light which might otherwise never have been known. Among other things, it appeared that Castillo had arbitrarily ordered some of the Indian boys to be cruelly flogged. Figueroa, as soon as he heard of it, wrote a letter reprimanding him in the severest language and declaring that neither Castillo nor any other person would be permitted to infringe the laws, which prohibited the flogging of Indians even though they were mere boys.[3]

Returning to Ortega, we find that he was not only not molested, but, when, after Figueroa's death, Mariano Vallejo, December 15th, resigned his position as comisionado, Ortega succeeded him as administrator of the mission at a salary of $500.[4] Fr. Quíjas accordingly staid at San Rafael and attended San Francisco Solano as a mission station. Such was the outcome of the complaints against Vallejo, the same who since his appearance in public, for reasons which are a

---

[1] "Figueroa was not a model in respect of private morality; his favorite vice was gambling; and, though there is some evidence that he had a family in Mexico, he kept a mistress, and left a natural daughter in California." Bancroft, iii, 738; 297.

[2] Associate commissioner for secularization of Mission Dolores in 1835, says Hittell, iv, 743. Bancroft (iii, 377; 700) says this Castillo was receptor of government revenues at San Francisco in 1833-1835.

[3] Hittell, ii, 210-211.

[4] Bancroft, iii, 720.

mystery, never ceased to accuse the friars of cruelties towards the Indians, and continuously boasted of his gentleness towards the natives. The following letter to the governor may serve as a specimen. For self-glorification, personal vanity, and lying charges against the poor missionaries it probably has no equal. "I have made various attempts to penetrate to the interior," he reports two years before the above-mentioned episode, "but I could not succeed. I sent word to the pagans and Christians, assuring them that they should not be molested if they remained quiet, and I made use of all that I thought would be to the purpose for gaining their confidence. Lately I have been informed that my promises and assurance have had a good effect, inasmuch as the good treatment which they have received from me and my troops is a good proof. The majority of them wonder at seeing themselves treated gently and with sweetness (so that they look upon me as a great captain), even by some corporals now under my command who had unceasingly and unduly persecuted them while under the command of the missionaries.[5]

"It is necessary to confess, Your Honor, that great violence and injustice has been committed against the unhappy natives by those entrusted with the administration of justice in temporal and more so in spiritual matters, and that the abuse of these people is the origin and primary cause of the deplorable results which are experienced, and which have rendered our true Religion, the mildness of the Gospel, and true morality ridiculous.[6]

---

[5] The soldiers commanded by the missionaries! A monstrosity, to use Vallejo's term, which only such as he could charge. We know that, since the Mexican independence at least, the soldier guards would take no "orders" from the friars even to go after runaways. It was the missionaries who ever had reason to complain of military disregard for the poor neophytes, as these pages have demonstrated time and again. The Indians, by the way, were adepts at "Blarney." They knew Don Mariano to be fond of it, so they applied it thickly. Hence the "gran Capitan."

[6] What "true morality" must be in Vallejo's opinion can be seen from his own example and that of Ortega. The Fathers, of course, abhorred it. Vallejo could have given the pharisees lessons in hypocrisy.

"At the same time it is necessary to concede to these unhappy people the right to seek redress by making themselves feared in large numbers, and to remain in hostile attitude. These are the natural consequences of the bad faith, the maltreatment and cruelty of the missionaries, and of the sanguinary system which they introduced, and which they wanted to persuade people to believe is the method and style of Jesus Christ. What monstrosities! It would not be difficult for me to place before Your Honor some cases which actually occurred in the missions of this section, and such as would horrify the most brutal man; but I omit them because this is not the occasion for it,[7] and also in order to shorten my report." [8]

A veritable windmill-fighting Don Quixote this Don Mariano. To call the gentle mission system sanguinary is putting things on ends. We here discover how the poor, sickly Figueroa was goaded by the *paisano* chiefs into removing the poor missionaries, for this report of Vallejo was drawn up before the act of confiscation received the government signature. We do not believe that the blustering demagogue could have been sincere in his ravings. He had no reason for such wild language; but he loved to stand out conspicuous in some way. Vanity, conceit, and arrogance were his besetting sins. Vallejo was particularly fond of being applauded as "general" or "great captain," though he never had command of as many as three hundred soldiers at one time, and had hardly ever achieved an act of real bravery. He was all bluster and heroism against helpless priests and unarmed or badly armed Indians.[9] He imagined he could shine especially by railing at defenceless friars worse than infidels are

---

[7] Such is Vallejo's fashion. He makes general charges, but never substantiates any of them. He was justly styled the "Windbag" and "Fox."

[8] Vallejo to Figueroa, May 5th, 1833. "Cal. Arch.," St. Pap., Mis. & Col. ii, 224-225.

[9] "Five hundred soldiers is a favorite newspaper statement of Vallejo's force. Twenty-five would perhaps be a more accurate estimate," says Bancroft, iii, 295, referring to the "general's" raids in the north.

accustomed to rail, because it appeared to be the fashion with the apparently educated men whom he had encountered, such as Echeandía, Padrés, the Frenchman Prudon, and similar unscrupulous practical infidels. It seems sufficiently plain that the worst slanders circulated against the missionaries may be traced to Mariano Vallejo. That is enough to disgrace him for all time to come.

Unlike the mission enemies of Vallejo's stripe, the missionaries specified the charges, complaints, or protest which they made in behalf of their Indian wards, or when they had to remonstrate against the encroachments of civil or military officials. We shall here adduce only one instance of a kind that was of common occurrence at this period. It shows to what length the insolence of the administrators would go, and how, as in the case of Vallejo, they contrived nevertheless to make the missionary appear the culprit. It happened at San Francisco, the very place whence the pompous Don Mariano addressed the just quoted calumnies to the governor, though twenty-one months later. Fr. Commissary Prefect García Diego on February 3rd, 1835, found himself compelled to complain as follows to the governor: "From the accompanying transcript you will learn of the excesses committed by Joaquín Estudillo and Pedro de Castillo of San Francisco. Supposing the misdeed, which they charge against Fr. José Gutiérrez, to be true, the comisionados are not his superiors that they may reprimand him and arrogate to themselves an authority which in these missions under my jurisdiction belongs exclusively to me; and against this authority they have made an attempt.

"If the missionary Father be culpable, they should notify me so that I myself may examine his fault and may correct him according to my powers. I, and I exclusively, must qualify the gravity of such a fault, and must act according to the laws that govern us. It is clear that said gentlemen know not, nor have they the duty to know, when and in which cases a priest is delinquent who refrains from administering the Sacraments, and when and in which circumstances he is not bound to administer them. The duties of said gentlemen are laid down in detail in the *Reglamento*

Provisional, and therein is not contained that they must reprove the missionary Father for his faults, and must act in defiance of the authority of the prelate.

"The comisionados are parishioners of the missionary Father, and his subjects in spiritual things. They must therefore respect his sacred character and not reprehend him, for it is not in order that he who is subject should reprimand the superior. From what has been said Your Honor cannot fail to perceive that J. Estudillo and Pedro de Castillo have insulted, wronged, and provoked the missionary Father of San Francisco, and at the same time they have usurped my authority by reproving one of my subjects in a matter which pertains exclusively to my inspection. I therefore present myself to Your Honor, as the governor of the territory, and the protector of the Church, and ask in justice that said gentlemen be obliged to render the Father as well as myself the satisfaction due to our character, and to the dignity of our ministry."[10] What the result of this dignified protest was, we are unable to say. The reader will here remember another instance where Don Mariano accused the missionary, and where Fr. García Diego too hastily accepted the accusation which later on proved to be false. The Fr. Commissary, meanwhile, had learned to be chary about accepting the word of any of the Californians at its face value.[11] Bancroft, too, has discovered that their assertions are of no value unless corroborated by documentary evidence.[12]

We must now return to the subject of politics in order to keep in clear view the beneficiaries of mission spoliation; for as Hittell, who favored the confiscation out of pure enmity to monks in general, at last acknowledges, "The mission properties, instead of being applied for any length of time for the benefit or the advantage of the Indians, soon began to find their way into the hands of private individuals; and the commissioners and officials in general began to grow rich. The

---

[10] Fr. García Diego to Figueroa, February 3rd, 1835. "Archb. Arch.," no. 2192.

[11] See case of Fr. Mercado, chapter ix, this section.

[12] Bancroft, iv, 762.

gente de razon[13] were all, generally speaking, more or less interested in the administration, such as it was, of the mission properties. If not interested directly, they were interested indirectly. If they derived no personal advantage to themselves, their relatives or friends did. The Indians were an ignorant race incapable of asserting their rights;[14] they therefore had no voice; nor were they provident enough to regard the future or the future of their children.[15] Under these circumstances the commissioners could act very much as they pleased; and there was no one to complain or raise his voice against their abuses except here and there a missionary, who, however, cried out without avail."[16]

At the election held in Monterey October 16th, 1834, the electors chose José A. Carrillo delegate to the Mexican Congress. Mariano Vallejo was elected substitute. Carrillo seems to have been at his post early in 1835. At all events, his influence is apparent in the promulgation of a decree of Congress by President ad interim Miguel Barragan, dated Mexico, May 23rd, 1835, which declared that "The Pueblo of Los Angeles in Alta California is erected into a city, and it will in the future be the capital of that territory." Although this governmental resolution was not officially published in California until the month of December, the news reached Monterey in October. The effect there may be imagined. The town council was called to meet on October 12th, and on the 14th decided that "the reports of the territorial congressman were based on selfish interests." The legislative

[13] "People of reason." The term comprised all who were not Indians.

[14] For that reason, if for no other, they should have been left in charge of those who would defend the rights of the Indians to their property, and who without compensation had preserved and increased it for them heretofore.

[15] All the more reason why the Indians should not have been deprived of their guardians who would, as in the past, have regarded the future for them. The charge that the friars made no effort to advance the neophytes was proven false by Mrs. H. H. Jackson in her "Glimpses of California," pp. 66; 70-71. We may also refer the reader to chapters xv-xvi, vol. ii, section 1, this work.

[16] Hittell, ii, 209.

assembly voted to remain with the governor at Monterey which had been the capital from the beginning. A report of the proceedings was sent to Mexico where the authorities seemed to think it not worth the while to insist on the change.[17]

At the election mentioned before, October 1834, members of the territorial assembly were also chosen. The records are incomplete, wherefore there is some doubt respecting a few of those elected. What is certain is that the hold-overs were José Antonio Carrillo, then in Mexico as delegate to Congress, José M. Estudillo, and José Castro.[18] The newly elected members were Juan B. Alvarado, Manuel Jimeno Casarin,[19] Antonio Buelna, and one other. One substitute was Salvio Pacheco. José M. Maldonado during the early sessions acted as secretary.[20]

The sessions of the territorial assembly opened on August 25th, 1835. José M. Estudillo was absent on account of illness. Governor Figueroa made the opening address. In May of the same year he had notified the Supreme Government that he should be obliged to surrender his office temporarily in order to seek relief for his health. On the 27th of August he announced to the assembly that the senior member present, José Castro, should assume the office of civil governor during his absence, and on the 29th he issued an order to that effect. As acting governor Castro then presided at the various sessions. Instead of improving, Figueroa's health declined so rapidly that on September 6th he had to take to his bed. On September 22nd, therefore, Figueroa definitely resigned, and in accordance with the national law of May 6th, 1822, directed that the senior member present at the sessions, José Castro, should succeed him as temporary civil governor. At the same time he summoned Lieutenant-Colonel Nicolás Gutiérrez, the ranking officer in

---

[17] Bancroft, iii, 258; 292-293; Hittell, ii, 216, 217.

[18] Son of José Tibúrcio Castro; both are often confounded.

[19] He was the brother of the two Jiméno Fathers.

[20] "Cal. Arch.," Leg. Rec. ii, 250; Dep. St. Pap., Benicia, Misc. ii. 416; Bancroft, iii, 291-292; Hittell, ii, 213.

California, to the capital in order to assume the position of comandante-general or military commander.[21] On the 27th of September Figueroa made his last will. It contained the following instruction: "In the first place I commend my soul to God, its Creator and Redeemer, and the body to the earth as the common mother of all mortals. Nevertheless, I wish my body to be deposited, if it shall be possible, in the church of the Santa Barbara Mission, and I solicit its better conservation through the care of the Fernandino religious, whom it may please to do me this charity, and also to preserve my ashes if the Supreme Government, to which an account shall be sent at the first opportunity, does not direct otherwise." [22]

So the man, who had deprived the devoted missionaries of the homes which they had reared at their own expense with the help of the neophytes, and who had subjected these benefactors of California to the mercy of unsympathetic hirelings, himself in his last moments begged his victims for a resting-place for his remains among those of their brethren, in the burial place reserved for priests and religious! It looks very much like retribution. It is somewhat strange that Figueroa should prefer to have his body rest with the Spanish friars rather than with the Mexicans, and that, too, at the headquarters of Fr. Presidente Durán, whose banishment he like Echeandía had recommended to the Mexican Government! However, the more we penetrate the subject we come to the conclusion that, as in the matter of the confiscation of the missions, the late governor was goaded into this unwarranted act of hostility to Fr. Durán by the relentless California chiefs. It may also be that the late governor

[21] Bancroft, iii, 295, 298; Hittell, ii, 213. This author makes the governor die at San Juan Bautista, which is an error.

[22] "En primer lugar encomiendo mi alma á Dios, quien es su Criador y Redentor, y el cuerpo á la tierra como madre comun de los mortales; y no obstante quiero que mi cuerpo se deposite, si fuera posible, en la Iglesia de la Mision de Santa Barbara, procurando su mayor conservacion al cuidado de los religiosos Fernandinos que gusten hacerme la caridad, tambien de conservar mis cenizas si el gobierno no dispone otra cosa á quien se dará cuenta en la primera oportunidad." "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. iv, 181.

knew that Santa Barbara mission church was the only one which had burial vaults beneath the sanctuary.

When he saw his end approaching, the dying governor called for the spiritual ministrations of Fr. Comisario-Prefecto García Diego of Santa Clara; but, as the latter failed to arrive in time, Figueroa received the last Sacraments, except holy Communion, at the hands of Fr. José Real, then in charge of the parish of Monterey and Mission San Carlos. Holy Viaticum was not administered because of the inclination to vomit which Figueroa suffered. Fr. García Diego at last arrived just as the governor was about to surrender his soul to its Creator, between four and five o'clock in the afternoon of September 29th, 1835. The funeral rites were apparently performed by the Fr. Commissary, assisted by Fr. Bernardino Pérez, his secretary, and Fr. José Real, as we learn from the entry in the parish register of Monterey which reads as follows: "On October 2nd, 1835, there was deposited,[23] in the vacant room of the church fronting the sacristy on the Gospel side,[24] the body of Don José Figueroa, Brigadier-General, and Governor of this Territory. He died on the 29th last past after receiving the holy Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction. Owing to the nausea which he suffered, Holy Viaticum was not administered to him, but he passed away in an edifying disposition. The funeral was held with the solemnity and pomp due to his merit, five squads of soldiers marching ahead of the remains. The body will be transferred to Mexico, as he has commanded in his testament. In testimony whereof I affix my signature. Fr. José Maria del Refúgio Suárez del Reál. Monterey, October 2nd, 1835." [25]

On October 10th, while the body of the deceased governor lay in the room adjoining the church waiting to be transferred to its destination, the territorial assembly met at Monterey, and on the 13th passed resolutions in keeping with the pompous style usually adopted by the Mexican and Cali-

[23] after the funeral services, of course.

[24] This room with the said sacristy on that side has disappeared.

[25] Libro de Entierros de Monterey.

fornia leaders of those days, but too exaggerated to be sincere; for if they had been sincere something might have resulted from them. After a long preamble of fulsome praise, Juan B. Alvarado closed as follows: "Let us immortalize his glory and our gratitude,[26] and encircle his brow with a crown of *'siempre viva.'* Yes, Most Excellent Sirs, listen, and please approve of the following propositions or resolutions:

1st. "The portrait of General Don José Figueroa shall be placed in the Hall of the Sessions of this *Excelentisima Diputacion* in proof of the esteem they bear for his distinguished merit.

2nd. "To perpetuate his memory, and the gratitude of this Corporation,[27] a durable monument shall be erected, with an appropriate inscription, in one of the most public unoccupied sites in the capital; and to fulfill which the *Ilustre Ayuntamiento* [28] shall be authorized to have its sole direction and care.

3rd. "Three copies of these proceedings shall be drawn up. One shall be delivered to the executors of our beloved deceased General and Chief, another copy shall be transmitted to his widow and children, and the third shall be passed to the printer that it may be annexed to the *Manifiesto* of said General, which is now in course of publication."

These resolutions were adopted, then Manuel Jimeno on the 14th of October offered two others:

1st. "That the three resolutions of Señor Alvarado shall be put into execution immediately.

2nd. "That at the bottom of the portrait of Señor General Don José Figueroa shall be affixed the title of *'Bienhechor del territorio de la Alta California.'* " [29]

---

[26] That was about the real object of these legislators: the immortalizing of themselves, for the whole action ended with these words.

[27] Figueroa had done the bidding of the California chiefs and given them the missions as their prey. Surely, they should have been grateful.

[28] The Illustrious Town Council of Monterey.

[29] "Benefactor of the Territory of Upper California."

The august town council of Monterey now took the matter in hand, and in turn resolved to place upon the monument the following inscription: "The Provincial Deputation and the Town Council of Monterey, At Public Cost, In Proof of Gratitude, Dedicate This Monument to the Eternal Memory of GENERAL DON JOSÉ FIGUEROA, Military and Political Governor of Alta California, The Father of the Country, Who Died at This Capital September 29th, A. D. 1835, Aged Forty-three Years." [30] "Days! months!! years!!!" Robinson exclaims ten years later, "have rolled away, and yet naught has been done to perpetuate the memory of this exalted man! the country's loss! This serves to show a want of sincerity in those *who most deeply deplored his death,* and the instability of their character." [31]

The remains of the governor, in charge of Captain Juan Antonio Muñoz, were at length placed on board the brig *Avon,* which on October 19th set sail for Santa Barbara where it dropped anchor on the 27th. Next day the coffin was taken to the shore by Captain Muñoz, and, under orders from the military commander of California, Nicolás Gutiérrez, received by Comandante Juan M. Ibárra of the Santa Barbara presidio. With all the pomp possible the body of Figueroa was taken to the presidio chapel of the town, and deposited for the night.[32] Next morning, Thursday, the funeral procession reformed and wended its way out to the mission where the religious ceremonies took place. Fr. Durán probably was the celebrant of the Requiem Mass, though strange enough no record was made of the event in either the presidio or mission records. The coffin with all that remained of the late governor was then deposited in one of the six niches of the crypt under the sanctuary floor. "The Rev. Fathers have conducted themselves in the best manner possible in solem-

[30] Robinson, "California," 176-179; Bancroft, iii, 295-296; Hittell, ii, 213-214.

[31] Robinson, 180.

[32] "por haber sido dia de Misa," that is to say, October 28th, being the feast of the Apostles Simon and Judas Thaddeus, was a day of obligation to hear Mass in those days. The ceremonies were therefore postponed to the next day.

nizing the honors of the said Señor," [33] Comandante Ibárra significantly closes his report to Gutiérrez.[34]

We have related the circumstances of Governor Figueroa's death and funeral somewhat minutely for the reason that all writers, including Bancroft, are at sea on the subject, especially as to the burial place. With the documents before us it is possible to remove all doubts once for all. The body was never taken from the crypt where it had been laid on the date mentioned. On August 24th, 1911, all the niches in the vault which had been walled up years before were opened. It was discovered that one of them contained a well-preserved coffin. On removing the lid it was seen that it held the remains of a military officer of the highest rank. The uniform was rich and, though soaked with the water which had penetrated the place, it was in good condition. The shoulder straps seemed to be of silver. The chapeau lay over the lower limbs. The sword, however, had rusted away to within about eight inches of the hilt. On the right side lay a gold-headed cane. The body itself had decayed as the uniform lay flat and shriveled, but the skull still had a thick growth of long dark hair. It was very small and corresponded with the size of the corpse which measured not more than five feet, or at most five feet two inches. Only one other military person, Captain José de la Guerra, had been buried in another niche of the crypt, and it was identified, as well as that of his son Pablo. With many other members of the community, besides two laborers, we viewed and examined the contents of the coffin, so that there can be no doubt with regard to the whereabouts of Governor Figueroa's remains. A record was drawn up of the contents of the sev-

[33] "Los Rev. Padres se han portado lo mejor que se han podido en solemnizar las honras de dicho Señor." Possibly he expected them to resent the proposition of placing the body in their vaults, or to show some sign of ill feeling. They felt only pity for him.

[34] Comandante Ibárra to Comandante-General Nicolás Gutiérrez, October 29th; Gutiérrez to the Secretary of War and Navy, November 13th, 1835. "Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap. iv, 157-159; 181; "Libro de Inventarios," Santa Barbara Mission, p. 47.

FUNERAL OF GOVERNOR JOSÉ DE FIGUEROA AT SANTA BARBARA, OCTOBER 29th, 1835.

eral niches, and then they were again walled up by the two stonemasons mentioned before.

It was rumored in Mexico that the late governor had not died a natural death, but that he had been poisoned! When, therefore, Fr. García Diego in the following year reached the capital, the Supreme Government requested him to report what he knew on the subject. "Comandante-General José Figueroa," he replied in writing, "greatly agitated *on account of the disturbances which the colonists of the territory caused or were about to cause,*[35] undertook to journey from Monterey to the port of San Francisco, and from there, almost without resting, he went to San Diego in order to tranquillize the minds, and to prevent any disturbance of the peace. When he had accomplished his desire, he in June returned to Monterey;[36] but he was already ailing, and without that robustness which one was wont to recognize in him at first sight. I myself, when I met him at Santa Barbara,[37] noticed as much, and even told him so. This illness and weakness continued until September 6th when he took to his bed. His sufferings increased until the 29th of the same month, when he died between four and five in the afternoon, the same hour in which I at his request arrived to assist him.

"In compliance with the wish expressed in his testament, steps were taken to preserve his remains. For that purpose the corpse was opened by Dr. Manuel de Alva in the presence

---

[35] "El comandante-general Don José Figueroa, con motivo de los trastornos que causó, ó iba á causar, la colonia en aquel departamento." This effectually refutes the assertion of the shallow Robinson, who without warrant chiefly blames "the repeated attacks of the missionaries and the representations of the Indians." He mentions the disorders in the land, also, but only in the third place. Robinson, "California," 175-176. Neither the friars nor their unfortunate wards attacked the governor. He could for himself see the ruinous consequences of his decree, and they may have troubled him somewhat, but it was the threatened disorders and those already existing that worried him and caused the killing trip.

[36] This was a feat in his weakened condition, and doubtless was the immediate cause of his death, or at least hastened it.

[37] Fr. García Diego was at Santa Barbara in May and June, as we know.

of the civil governor and various others who declared that no internal injury had been discovered, but that it had been noticed that some of the blood in the head was clotted, the result perhaps of much writing, or of the many past hardships, or of apoplexy with which he had been threatened several times. Hence, I find no solid reason that enables me to affirm that his death was brought on by poison. The Supreme Government must be in possession of the resignation which he made of his governorship, if I mistake not, in June of the same year. In this paper he gives as the motive his infirmities which absolutely incapacitated him to continue in office. So old then was the cause of his death." [38]

Fr. García Diego made preparations to leave for Mexico immediately after his conference with Fr. Durán at Santa Barbara in June 1835. The decision was probably reached on that occasion, and it was the Fr. Presidente of the Fernandinos without doubt who impressed the Fr. Comisario-Prefecto of the Zacatecans with the idea that a bishop should be appointed for California as a remedy for all the ills under which Religion suffered in the territory. At all events, Fr. Durán, as we know, had previously proposed the same plan to Governor Figueroa. On his way north from Santa Barbara Fr. García Diego made his last official visit to the missions under his jurisdiction as far as Santa Clara. At San Antonio he administered the Sacrament of Confirmation, the privilege of a commissary-prefect of missionary colleges, to one hundred and thirty-seven persons, mostly Indians. The record of his visit at San Juan Bautista is dated September 23rd.[39] On August 15th, in a circular he informed the Fathers that the Fr. Guardian of Zacatecas College demanded statistical reports concerning the missions. He accordingly requested the friars to transmit said information so that he might forward it to the College.[40] Once more we find Fr. García Diego exercising his office. It was at the bedside of

---

[38] Fr. García Diego, "Informe," Mexico, July 20th, 1836. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

[39] Mission Registers of San Antonio and San Juan Bautista.

[40] Libro de Patentes, Mision de San José.

the dying governor, as already stated. Finally he appointed the Fr. Presidente of the Zacatecans, Fr. Rafael Moreno, his vice-prefecto with the faculty of giving Confirmation, and then with Fr. Bernardino Pérez he on November 17th, 1835, embarked at Monterey for San Blas, Mexico.[41]

[41] Fr. García Diego, "Informe," July 20th, 1836. "Sta. Barb. Arch."

APPENDIX

A.

Necessity of Learning the Language of the Indians.

(To Pages 5 and 43.)

Fr. Comisario-Prefecto Vicente Sarriá must have had good reasons for issuing the circular urging the Fathers to acquaint themselves with the language of the neophytes in their charge. Though there is no direct documentary evidence, from stray remarks in the reports and occasional correspondence it may be inferred that some of the friars continued to avail themselves of interpreters in public addresses and sermons. This method of imparting religious instruction is at best but a makeshift, and never satisfactory to the zealous messenger of Christ who desires to reach the hearts of the people entrusted to him.

It cannot be doubted, as the earliest writers, among whom is the learned Solórzano, point out, that preaching in the language of the hearers renders the missionary's message far more acceptable and effective, and the missionary himself much more agreeable, than the same message conveyed through a second person, even if that person could reproduce the preacher's meaning exactly, which is scarcely possible. Especially is this true in the case of aborigines. The messenger of the Gospel who speaks the language of these people will find himself forthwith on familiar terms with them, and confidence and affection are likely to result from his first appearance. On the other hand, diversity of language, as Solórzano observes, is liable to cause estrangement and dislike of the man as well as the message so much so that his efforts may be in vain. Nay, he may find that, as St. Augustine has it ("De Civitate Dei," lib. xix, cap. 7), men would prefer to be alone with their dogs than with a stranger whose language they do not understand. In truth we are all practically deaf, as Cicero (Tusculum lib. v) says, in the languages which we do not understand; and according to St. Paul (I Cor. xiv) we are as much barbarians to those whose language we do not know as they are to us. (Solórzano, "Política Indiana," lib. ii, cap. xxvi, nos. 5, 32; Parras, "Gobierno de los Regulares," tom. ii, cap. vi. Both these authors go deeply into the matter, and the works of both were to be found in the California Missions.)

It cannot be expected that the Indian, for instance, should give up his language and learn the idiom of the stranger in order to acquire the necessary knowledge of the Gospel truths. That would render holy Religion doubly difficult, and therefore odious, to him, whereas it should be made easy of comprehension and attractive. For, if we with brighter minds, say our authors, find it difficult, and therefore neglect to learn the Indian's language in order to communicate the truths of salvation, how can we expect the dull mind of the indolent savage to learn the language as well as the Religion, when he is not convinced of the necessity of either, nay which he regards as superfluous? This would be placing a double load upon him, whereas we have to shoulder but one: the Indian's tongue or dialect. In elderly Indians the difficulty would be insuperable.

All this goes without saying. Hence it was that in behalf of the first missionaries, the Apostles, Almighty God worked a miracle so that representatives of the various nations at Jerusalem should be able to understand the Glad Tidings announced to them on that first Pentecost Sunday. We do not read that these men understood the language of the Apostles, but that each one understood the Apostles to speak in the language of the various hearers. This was a clear lesson for all missionaries. They were to adapt themselves in their speech to the people to whom they might be sent.

This being so, writes Solórzano (tom. i, lib. ii, cap. xxvi, no. 5), and inasmuch as we cannot always expect to receive the gift of tongues which the Apostles possessed, though Almighty God granted it sometimes to others among His servants, the missionary must submit to the drudgery of learning the language of the people in a more or less laborious way. All zealous missionaries, especially those who devoted themselves to the conversion of the natives in America, accepted this burden as a matter of course, and made it their first duty to acquire the language of their prospective converts. What difficulties this involved among an aboriginal people without any literature whatever, and what rare patience this required, the reader may gather from the reports of the Jesuit Fathers as related in the first volume, pages 67-68; 101; 158-159.

The matter, however, was not left to the zeal of the individual missionary. At a very early period laws were formulated which made the learning of the Indian language obligatory upon all who had the care of souls in Spanish America. One of the first regulations enacted on the subject was passed by the Second Provincial Council of Lima, Peru, as early as the year 1567. Canon 49 forbade the hearing of confessions by means of an interpreter. The Third Council of Lima, held in 1583, commanded that the ordinary prayers and the catechism should be taught in the language of the natives without obliging them to acquire our own idiom. "Que les

enseñemos las oraciones, y les catequizemos en su lengua, sin obligarles á que aprendan la nuestra." (Solórzano, lib. iv, cap. xv, no. 49; lib. ii, cap. xxvi, no. 7.)

Theologians early went further and declared that a pastor or curate placed in charge of souls sinned mortally if he were wilfully ignorant of the language of the people entrusted to him. Others included the missionaries who held such position. The reason was that the people had a right to know the divine truths, and therefore it was incumbent upon those who had the care of such people to communicate those truths in a manner which the people understood.

The duty is clear enough. From Fr. Sarriá's Circular it appears that some of the friars shirked this duty. Who they were it is impossible to determine. It is more easy to give the names of the Fathers who had acquired the language so that they could preach in it to the neophytes; but that properly belongs to the local history. Fr. Sarriá himself was of those who preached in the Indian tongue. The question, however, obtrudes itself whether it was possible for every missionary in California to master the idiom of the Indians in his district. In Lower California, as we know from the first volume, there were three fundamental languages which entirely differed from one another. The situation in Upper California was less favorable. Professor A. L. Kroeber of the State University of California affirms ("Handbook of American Indians," page 191, Bulletin 30, Bureau of American Ethnology, Part I, Washington 1907), "The dialects of almost all these groups (of California natives) were different and belonged to as many as twenty-one distinct linguistic families, being a fourth of the total number found in all North America, and, as compared with the area of the state, so large that California must probably be regarded as the region of the greatest aboriginal linguistic diversity in the world."

We ourselves can testify to this insuperable obstacle to effective missionary work among the California Indians. We have made strenuous efforts, as we had done with more success in Wisconsin and Michigan, to become familiar with the language of the natives in Lake and Mendocino counties. To begin with, we drew up a vocabulary of about two hundred and fifty words near Kelseyville and nearly as many among the Indians south of Ukiah, only to find that neither idiom would be of any use with other dialects less than ten miles apart. Previously to this we had collected about five hundred words and phrases among the Yumas on the Colorado. There was no similarity between that list and those made up in northern California save that in them all the consonants l and r were frequent, whilst they are altogether wanting in the alphabet of the Wisconsin and Michigan Indians. In despair we adopted the means of communication which the California natives employed

outside their own clan: the Spanish language. This as a rule was spoken by the men at least.

Probably the early missionaries were driven to adopt a similar course with regard to some of the various dialects or languages spoken within their jurisdiction. There was scarcely one mission whose neophytes all used the same language. At some of these establishments several totally different tongues were represented accordingly as the converts hailed from different rancherias, often not more than ten leagues distant. That the Fathers were able to overcome the obstacle implied is additional proof of the kind treatment the Indians received at the hands of the missionaries. Some one tongue probably predominated. This the priests doubtless mastered sufficiently to preach in it, and of the others they learned enough to hear the confessions of those that knew no other. Later, all, especially the children and young people, became familiar with the Spanish. Such was the situation at the missions. Whether any of the missionaries remained entirely ignorant of one or the other native idiom may be doubted. There may have been among the friars those who despite all their efforts found it impossible, especially in the absence of anything written in the native idiom, to grasp the construction of the Indian jargon, pronounce the words, or retain anything. With neophytes already somewhat instructed, and an expert companion at hand, this drawback was not serious. With the aid of the universal Spanish, and by means of signs, especially the always intelligible sign of gifts, the poor missionary would work with considerable success, as the number of converts on the Pacific Coast proves clearly enough.

Some of the missionaries may, in the midst of the multiplicity of duties, have taken this matter more easy than pleased the lively zeal and the wonderful talent of Fr. Sarriá, but it is not possible to name them. At all events, instead of preaching through an interpreter we should with his assistance have composed short instructions of about five minutes, all that the dull mind of the Indians could grasp on any subject, unless it be a simple story. This we should have read in the language of the Indians every day of obligation. Such was our practice in the beginning until after two years it was practicable to speak extemporaneously and at more length. Some of the friars may have pursued this method, but there is unfortunately no record of it, nor of many other interesting things of which nothing is now known, because the friars refrained from recording their experiences, their successes or their failures. We must infer much from the rules that were prescribed, and the general reports which the reticent missionaries were compelled to make to the Fr. Presidente, and through him to the government or the College of San Fernando.

Besides the discouraging multiplicity of languages, the mission-

aries found themselves face to face with another most formidable obstacle, the lack of adequate terms in the native jargon to explain the mysteries of Religion. The embarrassment increased with the founding of every new mission, for that meant one or more additional dialects or distinct languages with the same dearth of suitable words. The rude California savage's thoughts moved only within the range of what is material. He had no conception of things spiritual. Hence his vocabulary included only such words as referred to material things. It is a pity, and the historian cannot feel thankful, that the Franciscans, ever shy of relating their personal experiences and hardships, have left us entirely in the dark on this phase of their missionary life. We must, therefore, call the reader's attention to what has been related on this subject in volume i, pp. 67-68; 101, and 158-159, for it is certain that the missionaries in Upper California fared no better than the Jesuits in Lower California.

Two Fathers, Fr. Buenaventura Sitjar of Mission San Antonio and Fr. Felipe Arroyo de la Cuesta of Mission San Juan Bautista, have excelled in the knowledge of Indian languages, in that each composed a copious vocabulary of the idiom spoken at their respective mission, as the reader will know from the Introduction to volume ii of this work.

B.

Religious Instruction of the Settlers.

(To Page 6.)

The white population, composed of soldiers and colonists with their families, originally settled around the four presidios of San Diego, Santa Barbara, Monterey, and San Francisco. Later on immigrants from Mexico located at San José and Los Angeles. A few shiftless Mexicans were also gathered at Branciforte opposite Mission Santa Cruz. Outside of these colonies, some discharged soldiers and a few others possessed ranches in various parts of the territory; but the whole white population at the close of 1830 scarcely exceeded 4000, including about one hundred and fifty Americans, Englishmen, etc.

During the early years the people attended holy Mass and heard a Spanish sermon on Sundays and holydays of obligation at the nearest mission. Subsequently they had their own chapels where for their convenience one of the two missionaries from the nearest mission celebrated holy Mass and preached the Spanish sermon.

With people already well instructed this answered the purpose; but it was different with the children, and in this case, when the elders were so abjectly ignorant, altogether insufficient. Yet there is no good evidence that the priest on these occasions gave any systematic catechetical instruction to the little ones. The Fathers claimed that the missionaries were given charge of the Indians only, that they were not the pastors of the **gente de razon** or white people, and therefore not in justice bound to attend them, but that it was the duty of the government to provide secular priests for the colonists and soldiers. This was true, but inasmuch as no pastors were provided, it became the duty of the missionaries to attend these abandoned sheep, and to administer the Sacraments to them for charity's sake. This was the view held by Fr. Sarriá and Superiors; and this view prevailed in practice, so that the settlers always could receive the Sacraments at the hands of the missionaries whenever they desired. (See vol. ii, 541.) Whether it was possible for the Fathers to do more while they had to provide for the corporal as well as spiritual wants of the Indian, their first duty, and later when one missionary, without a companion, was compelled to provide for the corporal necessities of the soldiers and their families also, the attentive reader of the past chapters may decide for himself. The need for more instruction for the white adults was glaring enough, and Fr. Sarriá therefore urges the friars to make every effort in this direction. The question is, were the people eager enough to be enlightened on what they must believe and do in order to secure life everlasting? Well, the priests who have any number of the descendants of the early colonists within their jurisdiction, we dare say are not in a mood to blame the early missionaries. If as early as 1798 (see vol. ii, 543) Fr. Presidente Lasuén bitterly complained of the religious indifference among soldiers and settlers, what must be said of the period when with Echeandía's coming the floodgates of indifference and irreligion had been set wide open? at the time when the Picos, Vallejos, Alvarados were still boys? Doubtless more than one missionary in disgust may have felt that his charity was wasted, and that he better confine himself to his Indians in order to preserve them at least from contagion.

Whether the overburdened Fathers tried to preserve the children of the white people by instructing them separately is not clear. We shall have to come to a conclusion by judging the condition among their descendants at this day. Of Fr. Amorós at San Carlos we know from tradition that he would have little presents ready for the boys and girls who knew the catechism whenever he appeared at Monterey for Divine Service. Whether the parents sent their children to the mission for instruction is not very probable. The children of the mission guards may and may not have joined

the Indian boys and girls when the missionary daily, as was prescribed, gathered the little ones around him for the catechism. The children of the immigrants were therefore dependent upon their parents or relatives for the necessary knowledge of Religion and its precepts. Inasmuch as the settlers and soldiers, save some old Spanish families, had been recruited from the lowest and most ignorant classes of Mexico, we may imagine what instruction the adults could impart even if they had been willing. We fear the little ones learned very little besides what they saw their elders do at Divine Service. At all events frightful ignorance of Religion and the moral law is noticeable in even the men who became conspicuous, and who prided themselves for their superior intellectual knowledge and independence of priestly influence. We are not blaming any one; we are describing a situation, and trying to find its cause, because the effects are clear enough: disrespect for Religion, stupid antagonism to the missionaries, unbridled cupidity, contempt for Indian rights, and disregard of the moral law.

The grown people certainly had opportunities enough to be informed regarding their religious and moral duties, and of course there were those who heeded their spiritual guides, especially among the women and girls. Besides the Sunday sermon there would be special instructions on various days of Lent and Advent. Those who prepared to enter the state of matrimony had to go through a course of special instruction on the whole catechism. (See vol. ii, 544.) Nevertheless in all this we miss the special instructions for the little ones belonging to the settlers. Doubtless the conscientious parents would teach their children what was necessary, but few of them could do this intelligently enough to be able to dispense with the authoritative instruction of the priest. What the result then might be we can infer from no less a witness than the malodorous Pio Pico.

"In my childhood," he writes in his notes which he compiled for Bancroft, "I had advanced far in the prayers. ('Yo en mi niñez habia adelantado mucho en el rezo.') I knew the whole catechism of Ripalda from beginning to end, so that when strangers came from Mexico the mother of José Ant. Carrillo would call me. Then they made me recite the whole catechism (me hacian relatar todo el catecismo con los brazos crusados) whilst I held my arms folded. This brought me much praise." Our smallest edition of Ripalda has fifty pages. Pico must have been a precocious boy if he knew all that in his childhood. We believe, however, that he recited only the "Doctrina" which embodied the ordinary prayers, various acts of devotion, and the Ten Commandments of God followed by the Precepts of the Church, etc., as was daily recited by the Indians at their chapels. From what Pico adds in his notes we are convinced that he only boasted and for a sinister motive.

"Likewise," he says, "at Mission San Diego Fr. Fernando Martin, a most ignorant man ("hombre nada instruido") made me learn only how to serve Mass in Latin without understanding one word of what he said." Fr. Martin did what priests do now: he taught the boys to answer the responses at Holy Mass in lieu of a priest or some one else in Orders. The boy needs not understand "one word" of that part of the service, though he can find the translation in the prayerbooks. Pico only threw this remark in for the benefit of Bancroft to confirm the foolish notion of such as Bancroft that priests teach and preach only in Latin. At any rate, Pico shows that it is possible like a parrot to recite the whole catechism by heart, and not practice one of its teachings, notably the one that forbids lying and such things as are forbidden in the Sixth Commandment of God. Hence the necessity of religious explanation by an ecclesiastic or by other thoroughly informed and God-fearing persons.

To show what little good Pio Pico derived from being able to recite the "whole catechism," as he claims, we shall repeat here what Fr. Mariano Payéras, Comisario-Prefecto of the California missionaries, reported to the Commissary-General of the Indies in Spain regarding Fr. Fernando Martin, whom Pico vilifies. "For his zeal and application his merit is above the average, and his aptitude for the ministry which he exercises is evident. He could also be stationed among the white people, and with honor and edification preside over his brethren," that is to say, Fr. Martin was fit for the position of Superior. Yet Pio Pico dares to style him "hombre nada instruido." Well, we have already discovered with Bancroft what the testimony of the paisano chiefs is worth. They have certainly not taken the rules for their conduct from the Catholic catechism.

Sometimes the Spanish governors persuaded the colonists of the necessity of primary schools, but for want of teachers they never became a brilliant success. Some old soldier, who had received his elementary knowledge of letters from a missionary, or any other available man would be utilized to teach reading, writing, and ciphering. By order of the governors, notably of Borica, it was the teacher's duty to give instructions in catechism. How agreeably to the children he would impart what little he knew in any branch, especially Religion, and what exalted ideas the pupils carried away with them of the beautiful truths of salvation, may be inferred from a description Mariano Vallejo gives of the school at Monterey. Ordinarily we would not accept Vallejo's unsupported statement for anything. In this we must agree with Bancroft. The reason why his version is used here is because it corresponds so much with his own manner in dealing with those who

in the early days in any way were unfortunate enough to come under his sway. We believe he adopted the manners of the teacher.

"Rude benches extended along the sides of a long, low, adobe room, with dirty walls," Vallejo tells us. "On a raised platform at one end sat the soldier-master, of fierce and warlike mien, with ferule in hand. On the wall over his head or just at one side was a great cross and the picture of a saint, to which each boy came on entering the room to say a **bendito** aloud. Then he approached the platform to salute the master by kissing his hand, and received a 'bellowed' permission to take his seat, which he did after throwing his hat on a pile in the corner; and, as soon as a large boy had shown him the place, began to read his lesson as loud as his throat and lungs would permit; or, if learning to write, he ruled a sheet of paper with a piece of lead, and went to the master for quill and copy. At a certain hour the copies were examined, and the ferule was in constant motion at that hour. 'Here is a blot, you young rascal.' 'Pardon, master, I will do better to-morrow.' 'Hold out your hand'—thus ran the usual preliminary conversation. A more terrible implement of torture than the ferule, however, lay on the master's table—a hempen scourge of many iron-pointed lashes, held in reserve for such serious offenses as laughing aloud, running in the street, playing truant, spilling ink, or, worst of all, failing to know the Christian doctrine. The guilty child was stripped of his shirt, often his only garment, and stretched on a bench, with a handkerchief stuffed in his mouth, to receive the dread infliction.

"The course of study was six months or a year of primer, or **a, b, c**; six months of the Christian **Caton,** or second reading-book; reading manuscript letters of officers, padres, old women, or the master himself; writing from eight grades of copies, from straight marks to words; and finally, the four rules of arithmetic, with more Christian doctrine. This last-named branch was learned chiefly from Ripalda's catechism, the bugbear of every Spanish child, to be learned entire by heart, and recited in a monotonous sing-song—a perpetual torment, every page of which involved more than one scourging. Saturday was a day of examination and especial torture, when each pupil had to tell all he knew of Ripalda. Mothers sometimes showed sympathy for a child's sufferings; but fathers never." (Bancroft, ii, 427-428.)

Stripped of the exaggerations and distortions characteristic of Vallejo, we can well understand from this story how, unlike what it should have been, Christian doctrines were instilled into the minds of the children, and how they must have loathed the catechism which in the hands of the kindly messenger of Christ is a fountain of the noblest and sweetest aspirations. We can also understand how under such circumstances the vile and stupid vaporings of infidel writers could have appealed to the hearts of such

boys and transformed them into oppressors of the ministers of Religion, and robbers of Indian property. Though this cannot excuse them, it explains in a measure how they could so easily fall a prey to designing politicians and speculators of the Echeandia and Padrés stripe.

C.

Religious Orders and Their Enemies.

(To Page 98.)

It is a singular fact that wherever, in German and Latin countries, the so-called Liberals and Freethinkers obtain control of the government they straightway begin to make war on Catholic Religious Orders. Why this should be so is within the province of the historian on the missions to elucidate, because the California missionaries, being religious, likewise became victims of such politicians. Besides, the narrative itself will thereby gain in clearness. We shall, therefore, in a simple manner, so that all may understand, and as briefly as possible, endeavor to solve the mystery.

There must be some radical difference between the principles guiding the members of religious Orders and the principles of the so-called Liberals and Freethinkers, to whom may be added the infidel Socialists, because on this point they agree perfectly with the said Liberals. Only this will account for the relentless oppression and persecution exercised against Catholic religious wherever Liberalism by fair means or foul seizes the reins of government. There is such essential difference. It is so absolute that the principles of the one class necessarily exclude those of the other class like the day excludes the night.

What clearly distinguishes the religious from their bitter opponents above all is the object, aim, or end in view, and the means or methods employed to attain such end. Here we find that the religious and so-called Liberals have absolutely nothing in common.

The prime object or aim of the members of religious Orders, as indeed of every serious Christian, is ultimate union with the Creator. The faithful observance of God's Commandments will accomplish this with every Christian. The religious, as his name indicates, goes further. He endeavors in spirit to anticipate union with Almighty God even in this world by voluntarily, as far as possible, detaching himself from whatever might impede ultimate union with God, the destiny of every human creature.

Now the things that hinder this union of the creature with its

Creator, frequently frustrate it, and cause eternal separation, are according to St. John (I John ii, 16) Pride, Concupiscence of the Eyes, and Concupiscense of the Flesh. Pride and ambition brought about the downfall of the very prince of the angels, Lucifer, and his party, and still cause innumerable souls to turn their back upon God and His ordinances. Greed, avarice, cupidity not only induce many to sell their birthright to heaven for the sake of riches, but are the source of much heartless oppression of the poor and the laborers. In California the destruction of the missions and the dispersion of the neophytes must be attributed to this capital vice. Concupiscence of the flesh, or impurity, the unlimited gratification of the lower passions to the level of brutes, like the horse and mule that have no intellect, as the Bible expresses it (Psalm xxxi, 9), advocated by the rabid enemies of religious Orders, and of Religion itself, has resulted not only in the ruin of individuals but of nations.

These, then, are the chief sources of human misery for time and eternity. Why should we wonder, therefore, that, when Christ urged His followers to despise these breeders of destruction, countless men and women, as well out of love for the Savior as out of anxiety for their own salvation, denied themselves and cast away all ambition, sold their property or used it only to alleviate the sufferings of mankind, and mortified their flesh by refusing it even lawful gratification? At any rate, it is a matter that concerns only them; and therefore it is strange that men, who claim for themselves the liberty to live as they please, should deny to the Christian or the members of a religious society the right to follow the dictates and counsels of the Savior, either singly or in community with others.

If the individual is free to seek his happiness in spiritual union with his Creator on the lines marked out by Christ, why should not two or more combine to attain the same end the better, since in unity there is strength? Indeed Christ advises just such a course. "Where there are two or three gathered together in my name," He says (Matt. xviii, 20), "there I am in the midst of them." If men and women unite for worldly purposes, why may not men and women unite for supernatural purposes? That this renders them no less useful and loyal to human society, nor less submissive to secular authority, nay rather more considerate and valuable for their fellowmen, the numerous religious who devote themselves to preaching the Gospel to the heathen and others, to aiding the poor, the helpless, the orphans, the sick, the aged, the outcast, even the lepers, to education, to the sciences, etc., and who regard all these occupations as so many means of personal sanctification, prove to all but the wilfully blind and bigoted.

Such being the principles and methods of religious Orders, how is

it that so-called Liberals and Freethinkers, who prate so much about liberty, tolerance and the rights of man, forever openly and secretly harass and persecute the members of religious Orders for nothing more than exercising their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? In order to comprehend this we must examine the tenets openly promulgated and practised by said Liberals and Freethinkers in the territories under their domination, such as France, Portugal, Mexico, and some of the Central and South American States. Here we find the essential difference between the Catholic religious and their enemies standing out clear. The liberal and freethinking parties flatly deny that there is a God, or that if there is a God, He cares naught for His creatures, hence is a monstrosity. Moreover, they deny that ultimate union with Almighty God is the end and destiny of the creature. That, of course, is a matter which concerns them. Being free agents, they may hold what views they like and settle the account with their Creator, who in spite of their mouthings, as sound reason demonstrates, exists and will eventually demand an account; but with this freedom to hold any views they please Liberals and so-called Freethinkers are not satisfied. Unlike the Christians and especially the religious, who will not and cannot force their Faith or their religious practices upon others, the liberty-prating Liberals and associates will not permit a mode of life, for instance, that implies a closer union with God on the basis of the counsels enunciated by the Savior. The means adopted to prevent any such life in communities are ridicule, slander, and even physical force. The countries mentioned are in evidence, not in past centuries, but at the present day; for more atrocious cruelties against helpless monks and nuns than have been perpetrated in Portugal of late years have not been committed by the very Turks, and that, too, in the name of liberty of thought! There is no need to carry the parallel any further. It is plain enough that the real motive for the war of the Liberals and Freethinkers against the religious Orders is recognition and love of God on the one side and satanic hatred for God on the other; and this hatred of Liberalism for the religious, to use Father Faber's words, (Growth in Holiness, 274) is an index of the devil's dislike of them, and that, in its turn, is a measure of their power and of their acceptableness with God.

Appearances, of course, must be preserved. The world must be persuaded that there is cause for oppressing and suppressing religious Orders. If, therefore, only one monk or one nun prove unfaithful, which unfaithfulness invariably is the consequence of contamination with the cardinal doctrines of Liberalism itself, then the case is exaggerated out of all semblance to the truth. The whole community or Order, nay the whole Church is blamed. If no such opportunity offers, cases are manufactured and widely circulated. In the next volume we shall furnish some instances of this

kind concerning the missionaries of California. Inasmuch as the Liberals and Freethinkers do not hold themselves accountable to Almighty God, they do not hold themselves bound to observe the one of the Ten Commandments which forbids lying. Such action on the part of these enemies of religious Orders may therefore always be expected. It is in strict conformity with the tenets of infidel Liberalism.

Nor does Liberalism really care when a religious happens to forget or renounce his vows, (save that such an occurrence is a balm, and may be utilized as an excuse for oppressing whole communities) provided that such an unfaithful individual emancipates himself from the Church as well. In that case he is heralded as a paragon of learning and virtue. It is not the unfaithful religious who is hounded and banished for moral corruption, but the loyal religious for refusing to be corrupted. Thus it is that under the rule of rabid Liberalism strumpets are legalized whilst the pure little Sister of Charity is outlawed. The reader need but turn to France and Portugal to find this statement verified. In Portugal the infidel government puts a premium on vice among the clergy, in that it offers pensions to such priests as take women in "marriage." The truth is, the very presence of monks and nuns who lead pure and abstemious lives, who share their bread with the poor, alleviate sufferings, teach the little ones, console aching hearts, protect the innocent, etc., is a silent rebuke to their enemies. Hence their rage, and their determination to remove these silent monitors.

Much more might be said to show the utter hypocrisy of those who persecute religious Orders; but this much will suffice in answer to the question, which was pertinent to our subject, why the religious in Mexico, and per consequence the missionaries of California, were objects of hate to Liberals and Freethinkers.

Of course, we are aware that numerous others besides infidel Liberals, Freethinkers, and libertines decry monks and nuns. Some claim to be sincere Christians, and possibly they are in good faith; but they certainly know not what they are railing at. In their simplicity they take for granted that whatever is printed, sermonized, and speechified against Catholic religious must be true, whereas, if they would but approach the figure which like timid birds they have been led to fear, like thousands of converts they would discover to their confusion that it is only a hideous dummy or scarecrow; and they would laugh at themselves ever after for having been so gullible as to believe it to have been anything else.

There are others far more culpable because they cannot be in good faith. They proudly style themselves "liberal" Catholics, (see vol. ii, Appendix I) that is to say, such as with all their might strive to do what St. Paul cautions Christians not to do: (Rom. xii, 2. "Nolite conformari huic saeculo.") adapt themselves to the wild

notions of the world in religious matters. They, on the contrary, yield one point of Faith after another in order to be agreeable to those whose company, esteem, business, satisfaction, etc., they desire, in short, because it is profitable. Thus they are in the position of the unfaithful bank cashier who disposes of the funds entrusted to him not in accordance with the interests of his employers, but for his own profit. On this class of contemptible creatures we have nothing to add to the following quotation from the "Register-Extension," Toronto, Canada: "We have never yet met a Catholic 'liberal' who did not want the Church curbed in some way or another. The Church, from his standpoint, enjoys too much liberty, and he himself not enough. Where the 'liberals' are numerous enough to have things their own way, the first thing they begin doing is to rob the Church of her property, which merely goes to show that a Catholic 'liberal' at bottom is one who wants to see a liberal interpretation given to the commandment, **'Thou shalt not steal.'"** This is corroborated by the action of Minister Canalejas of Spain at the present day. He is just preparing an onslaught upon religious Orders.—After the preceding note had been sent to the printer, the enemy of law-abiding religious was suddenly rushed to meet his Eternal Judge by an anarchist. Canalejas wanted foreign-born monks and nuns barred out of Spain. It would have been wise if he had bent his energies on ameliorating the condition of the working classes, and on excluding revolutionary elements. The monks and nuns whom he sought to oppress only pity him.

D.

La Bula de la Santa Cruzáda.

(To Page 160.)

The Bula Cruzáda, Bulla Cruciatae, or Bull of the Crusades, was a Papal document containing privileges, indults, and favors granted to the Kings of Spain to aid them in carrying on the wars against the Moslem, and later for the promotion of Divine Worship and works of piety and benevolence within the dominion of the Spanish Crown.

It was called Cruzáda, because it contained privileges similar to those bestowed upon the soldiers in the expeditions for the recovery of the Holy Land. These expeditions were styled Cruzádas (Crusades), and the soldiers were termed Cruzádos (Crusaders), a name derived from the red or purple cross which, as a mark of their holy purpose, they wore sewed upon the right shoulder.

These privileges were granted to the Spaniards as early as July 1st 1089, by Pope Urban II. in behalf of the warriors fighting for the recovery of the city of Tarragona; April 1109 by Pope Paschal II.; 1118 by Pope Gelasius II. for the expeditions to recover the city of Sarragossa; again April 4th, 1122, by Pope Calixtus II. and June 11th, 1148 by Eugene III. for various expeditions in behalf of Christianity. The custom of granting such privileges was therefore a very ancient one.

The privileges in the first place consisted of indulgences which granted the remission of the temporal punishments due to sin **after the sins had been forgiven by means of a contrite sacramental confession.** Hence these indulgences, like all those of the Catholic Church, neither forgave sin nor gave permission to commit sin as ignorant declaimers assert. In this regard the indulgences of the Crusaders were like those granted now under like conditions: conversion of the heart from sin. In the second place, and this was the use made of the privileges in California, the Bull gave dispensation from the law of abstinence, that is to say, the person receiving the privilege was dispensed from the law forbidding the use of fleshmeat and other animal food, such as eggs, milk and cheese, at certain seasons and on certain days. It gave no dispensation from the law of fasting on one meal a day during the said periods or days appointed for fasting.

In order to communicate the privileges contained in the Papal Bulls to those who desired them, they were printed on paper leaflets. It was these leaflets or certificates enumerating the favors and the conditions for obtaining them which in the course of time were themselves called "Bulas" or Bulls. They could be obtained from a royal officer only, in California from the secretary of the governor or his representative in the matter, and were good for one year only. After the expiration of the year the certificate had to be renewed for another year unless the person preferred to abstain from fleshmeat and animal food on the days appointed rather than pay the small sum collected for such certificate. It was this feature, the payment of money for the certificate miscalled "Bull," which impressed the outsider with the idea that Bulls or Indulgences were sold, and imagining that these "Bulls" permitted the commission of sin, or forgave past sin, as the malevolent and ignorant Bancroft insinuates. The amount was really nominal. Persons of nobility, the higher clergy, etc., had to pay eight **reáles,** about one dollar. Ordinary Catholics paid two reales, or twenty-five cents. Moreover, this concerned only able-bodied people, not the poor, the infirm, the Indians, and those over sixty years of age, who were either exempt from the law of abstinence, or for sufficient reasons were dispensed from it by the respective pastors without the payment of money, and without the intervention of such "Bulls."

The chief point to bear in mind is that the Papal Bulls were granted not in favor of the Church, as has been asserted by dealers in fiction, but to the Spanish Kings. Hence the money was collected by royal officials, in California by a military person designated by the governor. The missionaries or priests had nothing to do with the collection or the money collected. This went into the royal treasury. With the end of the Spanish domination in America the privileges of the Bula de la Cruzáda likewise ceased. No more certificates of this kind were issued after the Mexican independence.

On account of the great distances of some Spanish provinces, as in California, the certificates or "Bulls" were issued every two years. We herewith reproduce the text of such a "Bull" for the two years of 1818-1819.

LA BULA DE LA SANTA CRUZÁDA.

For the Years 1818-1819.

"Whereas our Most Holy Father, Pius VII., by means of his Brief dated Rome June 14th, 1805, (addressed exclusively to our predecessor the Commissary-General of the Cruzada) has deigned to extend for nine years the Apostolic Indult so that all the faithful of both sexes, and of either the secular or ecclesiastical state, who reside in these dominions and islands, may eat wholesome fleshmeats, eggs, and other animal food (but observing the fast) on Lenten days and other days of abstinence during the year, with the exception of those to be mentioned below, which privilege according to the tenor of the Edict of our predecessor of December 4th, 1807, began to be enjoyed in these dominions with the two years' term of 1810-1811, and consequently expiring in the year 1818; and by means of another Brief issued also at Rome on March 20th, 1815, (likewise addressed to us, as Commissary-General of the Crusades,) the same Holy Father was pleased to extend for the next ten years only the said Indult, the first of which years in these dominions is the one of 1819, at the same time declaring that in this Indult are not included the Religious who are obliged by their vow to the perpetual use of Lenten food; therefore you N. N., who have contributed the alms of two silver **reáles**, which we have ordained in virtue of the Apostolic Authority conceded to us through said Brief of our Most Holy Father Pius VII., you who receive this Summary we dispense so that you may eat wholesome fleshmeat, eggs, and other animal food on Lenten days and other days of abstinence for the next term of two years, 1818-1819, with the exception only of Ash-Wednesday, the Fridays of each week in Lent, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday in Holy Week, the Vigils of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, of Pentecost, of the Assumption

of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, with this warning that in order to use this privilege you must have the Bula de la Santa Cruzáda (i. e. Certificate), and, moreover, if, being an ecclesiastic obliged to Lenten food, you have completed the sixtieth year. Given at Madrid, January 1st, 1817. Don Francisco Yañez Bahamonde." (Original in "Archbishop's Archives," no. 694).

E.

The Spanish Inquisition.

(To Pages 170, 564.)

The Inquisition concerned California but slightly. Like all Spanish provinces, the territory had its Commissary of the Holy Office, or Inquisitor. The appointment to the office was first thrust upon Fr. Fermín Francisco de Lasuén, the presidente of the missions, by the Commissary-General of the Inquisition in Mexico under date of October 15th, 1795. Thereafter the presidentes as vicars to the bishop also held the position of Inquisitor. The various decrees were sent to him from Mexico, and he would forward them to the Fathers who performed chaplain duties at the four presidios and the towns of Los Angeles and San José, for such edicts affected only white people; the Indians were exempt. Further than that Fr. Lasuén and his successors had occasion to exercise their office only by confiscating books and other printed matter which were heretical, immoral, and subversive of law and order. Thus, for instance, the works of the unspeakable Voltaire were confiscated at Monterey. Governor Borica ("Cal. Arch.," Prov. Rec. vi, 279) on June 1st, 1798, also gave orders to closely examine certain French books which a French pilot tried to smuggle into the country. The laudable object was to preserve the territory from contamination. He evidently held that unwholesome mental food might be as disastrous for the mind and heart as certain poisonous drugs or plants are for the body. Despite the diatribe of Hittell and his kind, this was nothing more than what the United States Government is practicing when it closes the mails to indecent and scurrilous books and periodicals, or to swindling schemes.

Though the Inquisition touched California so little, it is well to help the readers, who have no access to works that treat the subject honestly, to a clear idea about this institution, in view of the widespread misapprehension entertained by even so-called educated people who have permitted themselves to be victimized; for history on

this matter will have to be rewritten in order to bring it within the lines of truth.

The popular idea associates with the Inquisition a huge bonfire round which Spanish kings, bishops, nobles, and even ladies assembled like so many cannibals, to behold a number of poor wretches roasting and broiling. All these enjoyed the execution of heretics with as much pleasure as they would a bull-fight! This is what has been told, pictured, and passed around as **Auto-de-Fé** ever since we can remember. The truth is, an **Auto-de-Fé** (Act of Faith) consisted neither in burning nor putting to death, not necessarily; but partly in the acquittal of those who had been falsely accused, and partly in the reconciliation to the Church of those who repented. Then also it was simply a solemn "Sermon," which the heretics, and those found guilty of various crimes, about to be condemned had to attend, before being delivered to the secular authority. Hence the death penalty was not always inflicted at these solemnities, which were intended to impress the imagination of the people. Thus seven out of eighteen **Autos-de-Fé** presided over by the famous Inquisitor, Bernard Gui, decreed no severer penalty than imprisonment. Even H. C. Lea, the latest non-Catholic writer on the Inquisition (quoted by Vacandard, "The Inquisition," English by B. L. Conway, C. S. P., p. 207), is forced to acknowledge: "The stake consumed comparatively few victims" (i. e. heretics).

As to the Inquisition itself, the bogy of non-Catholics, it was a court of inquiry established by the Pope at the urgent request of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Spain for the purpose of ferreting out heretics and such Jews and Moors as pretended to be Christians, whilst they secretly continued their allegiance to their belief and planned the overthrow of the Christian power or government. Neither Jews nor Moors were molested for their belief only. Heresy, on the other hand, was against the law of the State and regarded as treason, for it was argued that whoever is a traitor to God's Church would likewise be a traitor to the government or the State. Besides heresy, however, various crimes came under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition, such as witchcraft, sorcery, astrology, superstition, blasphemy, and sacrilege.

Those who were found guilty after a close examination, if stubborn, were delivered to the secular authority for punishment. In many respects, therefore, the Inquisition corresponded to our Grand Juries. Like them, its duty was to make a secret inquiry as to the guilt or innocence of the accused. In the preliminary examination, in order to obtain a confession of guilt, if possible, the inquisitors pursued the custom universal at that time, and which corresponds with the methods employed by the police in our day and country under the name of "sweating process," or the torture of the cruel "third degree." Instead of the exquisite and "refined"

tortures used by our modern enlightened police authorities, the Inquisition in Spain, like the judges in all European countries, employed the rack. In so far, and in the manner of carrying out the death penalty, the Inquisition was no more barbarous than like authorities in other States of Europe in that age, nay, not as cruel as the death sentences and their execution under King Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth of England. This is not said for the sake of excusing the cruelties of the Inquisition, but by way of explanation, for we oppose any torturing to extract "confessions." The accused should be regarded innocent until convicted of guilt by convincing evidence, and therefore we regard the modern mental torture of the "Third Degree" not one whit less barbarous than the rack applied to the body in past ages.

There is an essential difference, say the enemies of Spain and of the Catholic Church. The Inquisition was an ecclesiastical institution, whereas the tribunals of other countries were civil courts which condemned on civil or military grounds. The inference is that the Church committed such cruelties, and that therefore she is herself cruel. If so, "it is a remarkable thing," says Balmes ("Protestantism and Catholicity," chap. xxxvi, "Inquisition"), "that the Roman Inquisition was never known to pronounce the execution of capital punishment, although the Apostolic See was occupied during that time by Popes of extreme rigor and severity in all that relates to the civil administration. We find in all parts of Europe scaffolds prepared to punish crimes against Religion; scenes which sadden the soul were everywhere witnessed. Rome is an exception to the rule; Rome, which it has been attempted to represent as a monster of intolerance and cruelty. The Popes, armed with a tribunal of intolerance, have not spilled a drop of blood; Protestantism and philosophers have shed torrents. The conduct of Rome in the use which she made of the Inquisition, is the best apology of Catholicity against those who attempt to stigmatize her as barbarous and sanguinary."

"A Pope established the Spanish Inquisition at the request of the Spanish rulers for the purpose of detecting heresy and heretics, and such infidels as simulated Christianity to injure the rulers. The judges, therefore, had to be experts, ecclesiastics; and in truth, the Pope in 1483 appointed Tomás de Torquemada, O. P., first Grand Inquisitor of Spain, and the assessors were ecclesiastics. In so far the Inquisition may be called an ecclesiastical institution, and might have continued such as in other kingdoms, though the Popes by no means approved of the abuses. In fact, Pope Sixtus shortly after its establishment declared the Bull, confirming the Spanish Inquisition, had been obtained from him by an imperfect representation of the royal intentions; that it was through a misconception of these he had confirmed the royal plan which, as it

now appeared, was contrary to the decrees of the holy Fathers and the general practice of the Church." (Hefele, "Cardinal Ximénez," 299.) Later on, the Inquisition became an "institution for the absolutism of the king" (Hefele, ibidem), and was therefore not at all a tribunal for whose acts the Church can be held responsible, even though ecclesiastics continued at the head. The reader, who will but examine Appendix G in the preceding volume, will understand how absolutely in the power of the Spanish king lay the Church, and how much more he controlled the ecclesiastics of the Inquisition whom he himself appointed. It was very soon practically a purely royal court, whatever it was in the beginning.

This is the view taken also by the non-Catholic historian Leopold Von Ranke. ("Ottoman and Spanish Empires," pp. 78-79. Edition Philadelphia, 1845, quoted in Tract Fifteen, "Society of the Holy Spirit," New Orleans.) "In the first place," the historian says, "the inquisitors were royal officers The kings had the right of appointing and dismissing them. . . . The courts of the Inquisition were subject, like other magistrates, to royal visitors. . . . 'Do you know,' said the king (to Ximénez), 'that if this tribunal possesses jurisdiction, it is from the king it derives it?' (Cardinal Ximénez died November 8th, 1517.)

"In the second place, all the profits of the confiscations by the court accrued to the king. These were carried out in a very unsparing manner. Though the **fueros** (privileges) of Aragón forbade the king to confiscate the property of his convicted subjects, he deemed himself exalted above the law in matters pertaining to this court. . . . The proceeds of these confiscations formed a sort of regular income for the royal exchequer. It was even believed and asserted from the beginning that the kings had been moved to establish and countenance this tribunal more by their hankering after the wealth it confiscated than by motives of piety.

"In the third place, it was the Inquisition, and the Inquisition alone, that completely shut out all extraneous interference with the State. The sovereign now had at his disposal a tribunal from which no grandee, no archbishop, could withdraw himself. As Charles knew no other means of bringing certain punishment on the bishops, who had taken part in the insurrection of the Comunidades, (or communities that were struggling for their rights and liberties) he chose to have them judged by the Inquisition.

"It was, in spirit and tendency, a political institution. The Pope had an interest in thwarting it, and he did so; but the king had an interest in constantly upholding it."

Hence the attempts to fasten the acts of the Spanish Inquisition upon the Popes and the Catholic Church, in the face of historical truth, must be regarded as failures. With regard to the penalties imposed by the Inquisition, truth likewise compels us to say that

they were in keeping with the spirit and usages of the times, and not more cruel than those inflicted in other parts of Europe for similar crimes. This is not meant as an excuse; for we abhor tortures of any kind no matter by whom or for what committed; but only in order to expose the utter ignorance or malignant hypocrisy of those who everlastingly point to the Spanish Inquisition as the embodiment of everything cruel and frightful. Frenzied mobs in our day, in the very heart of these enlightened United States, have frequently perpetrated brutalities which exceed anything that the most severe Spanish inquisitor is said to have been guilty of. The sanctimonious Puritans in New England have left on record samples of merciless barbarities against reputed witches, against Quakers, priests, and dissidents, which would shame the savages whom they have hounded and butchered out of existence. Whenever there is question as to where in Christendom the worst brutalities have occurred in the name of Religion or loyalty to the government, those who accuse the Spanish Inquisition simply bark up the wrong tree. The stigma should be placed where it belongs. As most of these charges originate with English and some American authors, it is but right to invite them to look up the records of their own ancestors. The embodiment of all that is savage, unjust, and merciless, if truth be their aim, they will discover in Henry VIII. and Elizabeth of England, for instance.

In the acts of these two rulers they will discover everything of which they charge the Spanish Inquisition: the rack, stake, dungeons, confiscation of property, and worse for refusing to acknowledge the lewd King Henry or his female facsimile Elizabeth as successor of St. Peter and head of the Church of Christ!

"The following," says Lingard, ("History of England," vol. viii, Appendix, Note E) "were the kinds of torture chiefly employed in the Tower.

"1. The rack, which was a large open frame of oak, raised three feet from the ground. The prisoner was laid under it, on his back, on the floor; his wrists and ankles were attached by cords to two rollers at the ends of the frame; these were moved by levers in opposite directions till the body rose to the level with the frame. Questions were then put; and, if the answers did not prove satisfactory, the sufferer was stretched more and more till the bones started from their sockets.

"2. The scavenger's daughter so-called, was a broad hoop of iron, consisting of two parts, fastened to each other by a hinge. The prisoner was made to kneel on the pavement, and to contract himself into as small a compass as he could. Then the executioner, kneeling on his shoulders and having introduced the hoop under his legs, compressed the victim close together, till he was able to fasten the extremities over the small of the back. The time

allotted to this kind of torture was an hour and a half, during which time it commonly happened that from the excess of compression the blood started from the nostrils; sometimes, it was believed, from the extremities of the hands and feet.

"3. Iron gauntlets, which could be contracted by the aid of a screw. They served to compress the wrists, and to suspend the prisoner in the air, from two distant points of a beam. He was placed on three pieces of wood, piled one on the other, which, when his hands had been made fast, were successively withdrawn from under his feet. 'I felt,' says F. Gerald, one of the sufferers, 'the chief pain in my breast, belly, arms, and hands. I thought that all the blood in my body had run into my arms, and began to burst out at my finger ends. This was a mistake; but the arms swelled, till the gauntlets were buried within my flesh. After being thus suspended an hour, I fainted; and when I came to myself, I found the executioners supporting me in their arms. They replaced the pieces of wood under my feet; but as soon as I was recovered, removed them again. Thus I continued hanging for the space of five hours, during which I fainted eight or nine times.'

"4. A fourth kind of torture was a cell called 'little ease.' It was of so small dimensions, and so constructed, that the prisoner could neither stand, walk, sit, nor lie in it at full length. He was compelled to draw himself up in a squatting posture, and so remained during several days."

One would think that under the rule of gentle woman such tortures would have been impossible. Not so under Henry's daughter. Speaking of the bloody statute against Catholics Hallam says: "This statute exposed the Catholic priesthood, and in great measure the laity, to the continual risk of martyrdom. . . . It is worthy to be repeatedly inculcated on the reader, since so false a color has been often employed to disguise the ecclesiastical tyranny of this reign, that the most clandestine exercise of the Romish" (Hallam must be excused for the nick-name. He was not friendly to the Catholic Church) "worship was severely punished. . . . The rack seldom stood idle in the tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign. . . . Such excessive severities, under the pretext of treason, but sustained by very little evidence of any other offense than the exercise of the Catholic ministry, excited indignation throughout a great part of Europe." ("Constitutional History," 87-95, as quoted by Spalding, "History of the Reformation," vol. ii, 196-198.)

The kind of execution to which the priests in particular were condemned, was no less brutal to the victims than shocking to the spectators. For diabolical inhumanity it surpasses the atrocities of the human sacrifices of Mexico at the time of Cortés. In en-

lightened England under Elizabeth the sentence "to be hanged, drawn, and quartered" was carried out in this way: The victims were suspended from the gallows, and almost instantly cut down before the sense of feeling was deadened in them; some had even strength enough to stand upon their feet till they were violently thrown down upon the ground by the executioner, and ripped up alive by the bloody knife; their heart and bowels were torn out and cast into the fire; their four limbs severed from the trunk, and exposed to public view. Where has the Spanish Inquisition ever perpetrated such atrocities? Truly, "Nero himself," as Archbishop Spalding indignantly exclaims, "raged not more cruelly against the Roman Christians of the first century, than did the English Jezabel against the English Catholics of the sixteenth!" (201.) Enough of this. We have stated but this much merely to show that railing against the Spanish Inquisition as the embodiment of cruelty argues ignorance, if not bad faith, on the part of those who even at this late date make such charge.

Nor in the number of victims has the Spanish Inquisition been nearly as cruel and merciless as the English persecutors. Victor Duruy, in his "History of Modern Times," page 181, as quoted in Tract Fifteen, Society of the Holy Spirit, says that "under Henry VIII. an inquisition more terrible than that of Spain covered England with funeral piles. Among the victims are counted two queens, two cardinals, three archbishops, eighteen bishops, thirteen abbots, five hundred friars and monks, fourteen archdeacons, sixty canons, more than fifty doctors, twelve dukes, marquises or earls, twenty-nine barons, three hundred and thirty-five nobles, one hundred and ten women of rank: in all seventy-two thousand capital punishments." Anglo-Saxon authors and speakers, and their kind in America, should study the history of their mother country before they enlarge on the barbarities of Spain or any other nation.

F.

Wealth of the Missions.

(To Pages 225, 415.)

Echeandía and the Californians had an object in exaggerating the wealth of the missions. Such descriptions whetted the appetite for the property of the Indian neophytes, (property of the **pádres,** as the traducers maliciously heralded over the country) and for the position of the missionaries as managers of the temporalities, nerved the covetous hand for speedy action, and with outsiders,

superficial closet-historians, and sensational magazine writers secured a shadow of justification for the robbery which they dubbed "secularization." How well they succeeded may be inferred from the following quotation from the vicious "San Francisco Annals," published by Frank Soule, John H. Gihon, M. D., and James Nisbet in 1854.

"In every sense of the word these monks were practically the sovereign rulers of California—passing laws affecting not only property, but even life and death—declaring peace and war against their Indian neighbors—regulating, receiving, and spending the finances at discretion—and, in addition, drawing large annual subsidies not only from the pious among the faithful over all Christendom, but even from the Spanish monarchy itself, almost as a tribute to their being a superior state. This surely was the golden age of the missions—a contented, peaceful, believing people, abundant wealth for all their wants, despotic will, and no responsibility but their own consciences and heaven! Their horn was filled to overflowing." (67-68.)

How little this agrees with the truth, nay, how it is at variance with truth in every particular, the attentive reader of this volume knows. If he turns to another work published thirty years after the "Annals," he will find the same absurdities related with additional unwarranted brutalities, and retailed as sober historical facts, we mean Hittell's chapters on the missionaries.

Now says Mofras correctly: ("Exploration Du Territoire De L'Oregon, Des Californies, et De la Mer Vermille," vol. ii, 335-447. The author visited California in 1841.) "It was the fundamental law of the Spanish mission establishments that the product of the labor and of the soil itself belonged to the Indians. The religious were only the administrators and directors. The sacred principle: **Pater est tutor ad bona Indorum**, obtained a strict interpretation, and the Superiors watched closely that the missionaries took not more from the revenues than was strictly needed for food and clothing. The Franciscans observed the vow of poverty and could not possess anything in their own name."

Under such a system of unsalaried and abstemious managers, the mission Indians in time, besides being selfsupporting, might have become exceedingly wealthy. What of it? The property was accumulated on Indian soil by Indians under wise and lawful guardians. The jealous and covetous Californians so-called might also have grown rich, had they been industrious and saving instead of gambling and wasting their days in vice-breeding idleness. At any rate, the mission property was Indian property, and should have been regarded as sacred and inviolable just as much so as other private property is held to be inviolable and sacred to the owners. We still see very small tribes of Indians under the guardianship of

the United States Government in possession of much larger tracts of land than any Californian mission ever claimed, and enjoying the revenues of large amounts of money held in trust for them by the United States authorities. Nevertheless, no one in his senses now thinks of depriving such Indians of what is considered theirs under such pretext as the Californians held forth in order to obtain control of Indian mission property and enjoy the fruits of Indian industry and missionary prudence, abstemiousness and unselfishness.

However, accumulation of wealth at the California missions was rendered impossible after 1811, when, in addition to maintaining themselves, the Indians and their guardians had to slave in order to keep in food and clothing and idleness the military of the whole territory, as is evident from the narrative in this volume. If Echeandía and the unscrupulous Californians, nevertheless, continued to claim that the missionaries were amassing riches for themselves, this was only for the purpose stated at the beginning. Let us take a glance at some of these charges, which even the honest Mofras was led to believe, in order to expose their utter absurdity from the official records. This for the present will be sufficient to characterize the men who endeavored to conceal their selfish aims behind such wild assertions.

A word on Bancroft in this connection which shows the utter duplicity of that historian. In the "History of California" the author disdained to utilize the following statements and figures, but in his "Pastoral" (chapter vi), which is his "very own" work, as the reader will remember from the Introduction to the preceding volume, Bancroft repeats them albeit with this caution: "People are apt to tell and believe great stories about money. Large sums in specie have been reported as existing at the missions, especially at San Gabriel, but such statements should be taken with allowance. Where was the money to come from? Most of the transactions with merchants were in exchange of goods. Therefore, let it be understood that when I give the amount of specie at a mission, I only repeat from the record, but without fully believing it myself!" (191.) Bancroft knows very well that neither the mission nor the government records contain any such statements. He takes them bodily from a Rev. Walter Colton, Protestant preacher, who after the arrival of the United States troops held the office of alcalde or magistrate at Monterey from 1846-1848, and later published "Three Years in California," the last chapter of which contains these revelations (?) about the riches of the missions. Whence he culled the assertions it is difficult to say with certainty; but, since he dedicates his book to "Gen. Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo," the suspicion that this Muenchhausen of California deceived the simple-minded preacher seems to be well founded.

Beginning with San Diego Mission Mofras was deceived into

writing that at the height of its prosperity it had 14,000 cattle, 32,000 sheep, and 1500 horses; whereas the correct figures are 9245 head of cattle, 19,654 sheep, and 1190 horses. Colton has no figures on this mission.

For San Luis Rey Colton claims 70,000 cattle, 68,000 sheep, and 2000 horses in 1826. The correct official numbers are for that year 20,312 cattle, 26,215 sheep, and 1365 horses. Mofras for 1834 gives 24,000 cattle and 100,000 sheep. There are no records for that year, but in 1832 San Luis Rey possessed 27,500 cattle and but 26,100 sheep. See Appendix J for report of 1832.

On San Juan Capistrano Colton remained ignorant, but Mofras is wild with 70,000 cattle, 2000 horses, and 10,000 sheep; whereas the highest numbers are 14,000 cattle, 1355 horses, and 17,030 sheep.

San Gabriel with Mofras has 105,000 cattle, 40,000 sheep, and 20,000 horses! Colton was told that in 1829 the mission had 70,000 cattle, 54,000 sheep, 4200 horses, and 400 mules. According to the official reports to the government and the College it possessed in 1829 somewhat less, that is to say, 25,000 cattle, 15,000 sheep, 2000 horses and 150 mules.

San Fernando Mission in 1826, according to Colton, owned 56,000 cattle, 64,000 sheep, 1,500 horses, 200 mules, and 2,000 swine. The Fathers certainly knew, as well as the governor, but they reported for that year just 4,100 cattle, 4,000 sheep, 780 horses, 70 mules, and 100 swine. Nor did the largest number in any year exceed 12,000 cattle and 10,000 sheep. This is not all. Colton gravely informs us that in 1826 it had "in its stores about $50,000 in merchandise and $90,000 in cash." Nay, "the hills, at the foot of which this mission stands, have, within the last ten years (i. e. before 1846), produced considerable quantities of gold. One house exported about $30,000 of it. This was the first gold discovered in California, and the discovery was made three or four years previous to that on the American Fork." All of which is news, but accounts for the crazy belief among the Mexicans that the Fathers possessed gold mines. Colton adds the marvelous remark, "The marvel is the search for it did not extend further!" Nay, the marvel is that such a story could be passed around. The Fathers knew of no gold at San Fernando or at any other mission. As to the cash at the mission, it may be safely asserted that there was not that amount in whole California. It may be doubted that this mission then possessed as much as $900. At any rate, San Fernando Mission only four years earlier, 1822, could contribute but one barrel of grape brandy, which was sold for the benefit of the Los Angeles church building, now the "Plaza Church." How during four years $90,000 in cash could have been saved, with the soldiers ever clamoring for food and clothing, explain who will.

San Buenaventura Mission, according to Colton, in 1825 possessed

as many as 37,000 cattle, 30,000 sheep, 600 riding horses, 1,300 mares, 200 yoke of working-oxen, 500 mules, 200 goats, and 2,000 swine. The reader will observe that the ex-alcalde is very specific. The true figures are for 1825 just 4,000 cattle, 5,300 sheep, 200 horses of all kinds, 68 mules, 35 goats, 60 swine, though in 1816, before the military began to operate like leeches on the mission body, this same mission owned 23,400 cattle, the highest number. In 1822, when Fr. Prefecto Payeras appealed to all, this mission was unable to contribute anything towards the Los Angeles church. Where the $27,000 in specie, $35,000 in foreign goods, and $61,000 in clothing and church ornaments, which Colton kindly allows the mission, could have come from is a mystery, especially when its largest crop of cereals of all kinds in one year did not exceed 9,000 bushels, and not 96,933 bushels, as some other overkindly writer dreams.

Santa Barbara Mission in 1834 is credited by Mofras with 5,000 cattle, 5,000 sheep, and 200 horses of all kinds, whereas the records before us have for that year 3,400 cattle, 2,624 sheep, and 340 horses. For 1828 Colton grants it 40,000 head of cattle, 20,000 sheep, 1,000 horses, 2,000 mares, and 600 mules. The Fathers would not have known with what to feed that many, nor would they have found cowboys enough to guard them, but they managed very well with 2,850 cattle, 3,600 sheep, 700 horses, and 200 mules.

Santa Inés in 1834 is given 14,000 cattle, 12,000 sheep, and 1,200 horses. There are no records for that year, but in 1832 the mission reported 7,200 cattle, 2,100 sheep, and 390 horses, after which date the number steadily decreased. Colton was hoaxed into declaring that "in 1823 Santa Inés possessed property valued at $800,000!" This was for good measure probably. He says nothing about the stock. We shall fill the gap. In that year it had just 6,000 cattle, which was within 1,300 of the highest number, 3,000 sheep, and 740 horses.

Purisima Concepcion in 1834, according to Mofras, had 15,000 cattle, 14,000 sheep, and 2,000 horses. Colton could surpass that in 1830 with 40,000 cattle, 30,000 sheep, 2,600 tame horses, 4,000 mares, and 5,000 swine! For the year 1830 the official reports have 7,000 cattle, 6,000 sheep, 1,000 horses of all kinds, and 50 pigs all told. Had the Fathers reported contrary to the truth the Californians would have howled and the governor would have investigated.

San Luis Obispo always was one of the poorer missions, yet Mofras was made to believe that in 1834 it had 9,000 cattle, 7,000 sheep, and 4,000 horses. The reports for 1834 are missing, but for 1832 they show 2,500 cattle, 5,424 sheep, and 700 horses. After that date the herds decreased. Colton, on the other hand declares that San Luis Obispo "has always been considered one of the richest missions in California." He accordingly goes to work and

gives Fr. Luis Martínez (who was banished in 1830) "87,000 head of grown cattle, 2,000 tame horses, 3,500 mares, 3,700 mules, eight sheep-farms, averaging 9,000 sheep to each farm." The official records of the mission know nothing of such figures. The highest number reported at any time was 8,900 cattle, 11,000 sheep, and 1,300 horses of all kinds. The veracious Colton asserts further that, "when its presiding priest, Fr. Luis Martínez, returned to Spain he took with him $100,000 of mission property!" This must be called the limit of gullibility and credulity. See for the truth chapters xvii and xviii, section i, this volume.

San Miguel Mission in 1834, according to Mofras, owned 64,000 cattle, 10,000 sheep, and 2,500 horses. The official reports for 1834 are not extant; but in 1832 they gave the mission just 3,710 head of cattle, 8,282 sheep, and 700 horses. After that herds and flocks decreased, so that Mofras must have been led into error. Colton, however, was hoaxed into writing that San Miguel in 1821 possessed 91,000 cattle, 2,000 mules, 1,100 tame horses, 3,000 mares, and 47,000 sheep. The exact figures are: 9,000 head of cattle, 13,500 sheep, 1,451 horses of all kinds, and only 61 mules. See facsimile report at the end of this volume.

San Antonio Mission, Mofras tells us, in 1834 had 12,000 cattle, 2,000 horses, and 14,000 sheep. In 1832 the official report gave this mission 2,500 cattle, 5,424 sheep, and 700 horses. In two years these could not have increased materially, rather a decrease must be expected under the circumstances. The gullible Colton generously granted San Antonio for the year 1822 as many as 52,800 cattle, 1,800 tame horses, 3,000 mares, 500 yoke of working-oxen, 600 mules, 48,000 sheep, and 1,000 swine. The official reports find only 5,980 cattle, 9,022 sheep, 884 horses, 45 mules, and 80 swine in the year 1822.

Soledad Mission in 1834 receives from Mofras 6,000 cattle, 1,200 horses, and 7,000 sheep. The exact figures as reported for that year are 4,500 cattle, 4,950 sheep, and 138 horses. Colton, on the other hand, writes this piece of nonsense about California's poorest mission for the year 1826: "Soledad, in 1826, owned about 36,000 head of cattle, and a greater number of horses and mares than any other mission in the country. The increase of these animals was said to be so great, that they were given away to preserve the pasturage for cattle and sheep. This mission had about 70,000 sheep and 300 yoke of oxen." For that same year, 1826, the official report, however, has 3,300 cattle, 1,100 horses of all kinds, 5,900 sheep, and 52 mules.

San Carlos Mission, strange to say, according to Mofras in 1834 had 7,000 cattle, 1,200 horses, and 9,000 sheep. The inventories and the official reports know nothing of such herds at any period. In that year the mission owned 312 cattle, 491 horses, and 9 mules.

Other items are not reported, a sign that there was nothing to report. Colton surpasses himself on San Carlos. "This mission," he writes, "in 1825 branded 2,300 calves, had 87,600 head of cattle, 1,800 horses and mares, 365 yoke of oxen, nine sheep-farms with an average of about 6,000 sheep on each, a large assortment of merchandise, and $40,000 is specie, which was buried on the report of a piratical cruiser on the coast." Fancy the Monterey paisano chiefs knowing that there were locked up in the mission "coffers" $40,000 in cash! It is not likely that the Fathers in 1825 had on hand $400 with which to meet the current expenses. However, according to the official report in that year there belonged to this mission only 1,500 cattle, 570 horses and mares, 18 mules, 10 goats, 19 swine, and 5,450 sheep. The Montereyans hoaxed the Rev. Preacher and alcalde most unmercifully.

Mission San Juan Bautista in 1834 is given 7,000 cattle, 1,200 horses, and 9,000 sheep by Mofras. The official report of that year is missing, but at the beginning of 1833 the mission possessed 6,000 cattle, 6,004 sheep, and 296 horses. Colton, as usual is very specific. He says: "In 1820 it owned 43,870 head of cattle, 1,360 tame horses, 4,970 mares, colts and fillies. It had also seven sheep-farms, containing 69,530 sheep, while the Indians attached to the mission drove 321 yoke of oxen. Its storehouse contained $75,000 in goods, and $20,000 in specie." Imagine the governor not far away and knowing $20,000 in cash lying around at San Juan Bautista while his soldiers walked about in rags for the last eight years! According to the honest reports of the missionaries this mission possessed in 1820 just 11,000 cattle, 9,500 sheep, and 675 horses.

Santa Cruz Mission, one of the poorer establishments, in 1834 according to Mofras had 8000 cattle, 10,000 sheep, and 800 horses. The fact is, according to the official report the mission at the beginning of 1833 owned but 3600 cattle, 5211 sheep, and 400 horses. No increase took place. Colton was certain that "so lately as 1830, Santa Cruz had 42,800 head of cattle, 3200 horses and mares, 72,500 sheep, 200 mules, large herds of swine, and $25,000 worth of silver plate." What the poor friars wanted to do with all that silver plate, Colton forgot to say. The official report for 1830 has these figures: 3000 cattle, 276 horses, 4827 sheep, 107 mules, and no swine whatever. It had no swine to report since the year 1819. The inventories know nothing of silver plate, save a chalice or two and other minor church articles.

Santa Clara Mission stock in 1834 is somewhat less erroneously stated by Mofras, as 13,000 cattle, 1200 horses, 15,000 sheep. In 1832 it had according to the official report 10,000 cattle, 9500 sheep and 730 horses. Colton, however, keeps at it in this fashion: "In 1823 Santa Clara Mission branded, as the increase of one year, 22,400

calves! It owned 74,280 head of full-grown cattle, 407 yoke of working-oxen, 82,540 sheep, 1890 trained horses, 4235 mares, 725 mules, 1000 hogs, and $120,000 in goods!" This all is news, indeed; for the official reports have told a different story concerning the year 1823, and it was the saintly Fr. Catalá who countersigned them. It then possessed 6050 cattle including the calves (the highest number at any time was 14,500 in 1828), 13,000 sheep (highest number 15,500 in 1828), 760 horses of all kinds, 20 mules, and only 20 hogs or swine. The stock of goods in the storehouse doubtless is also exaggerated. For ten years the mission had been aiding the troops with difficulty, so that the Indians could scarcely be provided with what was necessary.

San José Mission, says Mofras, in 1834 possessed 24,000 cattle, 1100 horses, and 19,000 sheep. This is scarcely possible, for in 1832 the official report, the last extant, gave the mission 12,000 cattle, 13,000 sheep, though as many as 1300 horses. Colton, however, finds that "in 1825 this mission had 3000 Indians, 62,000 head of cattle, 840 tame horses, 1500 mares, 420 mules, 310 yoke of oxen, and 62,000 sheep." The official report, on the other hand, for that year has 1796 Indians (highest number 1886 in 1831), 10,000 cattle, 650 horses and mares, 28 mules, and 15,000 sheep.

Mission San Francisco in 1834, according to Mofras, had 5000 cattle, 600 horses, and 4000 sheep. This was probably true, for in 1832 the report has 5000 cattle, 3500 sheep, but 1000 horses. Colton keeps on improving the situation in this way: "In 1825 this mission is said to have possessed 76,000 head of cattle, 950 tame horses, 2000 breeding mares, 84 stud of choice breed (as though the poor friars had engaged in horse-racing), 820 mules, 79,000 sheep, 2000 hogs, 456 yoke of working-oxen, 18,000 bushels of wheat and barley, $35,090 in merchandise, and $25,000 in specie!" It is a mystery where these statements originated, for there is nothing in official documents to warrant them. Let alone the cash and the merchandise, the former of which especially is a myth, the figures for 1825 are as follows: 3331 head of cattle, 287 horses of all kinds, 22 mules, 4034 sheep, no hogs whatever, about 1500 bushels of wheat and barley.

San Rafael Mission, says Mofras, at one time had 3000 cattle, 500 horses, and 4500 sheep. Colton is silent. The official reports have these figures: Largest number of cattle, 2120, in 1832; largest flock of sheep, 4000 head, in 1822; largest herd of horses, 454, in 1825; the largest wheat crop, 2458 bushels, in 1822.

San Francisco Solano Mission, the last one, at some time according to Mofras possessed 8000 cattle, 700 horses, and 4000 sheep. This is nearly correct except as to the cattle. The largest number

of cattle, 3500, was reported in 1832; the largest flock of sheep, 5000, grazed in its pastures in 1829; and the largest number of horses, 725, was found in 1831.

Colton is not the worst culprit on the subject. The climax of mendacity was reached in our day by one Jesse S. Hildrup, who in a pictorial description of the missions, published in 1909, gravely informs the unsuspecting readers that "in the latter days of their prosperity, when all the missions had been founded and their surroundings completed, two hundred thousand (200,000) head of cattle were killed yearly, netting a profit usually of ten dollars each. . . . The annual revenues of the Missions from sales and trade, tithes and rents, would aggregate in their latter and fully prosperous days nearly three million dollars; and it is stated upon authority (which?) that the padres sent to the Church in Spain and Mexico during the time of their existence more than twenty million dollars from their surplus accumulation of wealth. A still greater amount was taken from them in property and treasures by the Mexican Government under the orders of **confiscation**, which were finally passed by the Mexican Congress on the seventeenth of August 1833." As the reader of the present volume knows, all that this Hildrup proposes for our belief is entirely beside the truth. Elsewhere in the Appendix we present a tabular list of the missions and their products at the time of which Hildrup speaks. In Appendix H of the preceding volume he will find the pricelist of animals and the products of the soil or shop in California. It agrees with the pricelist of later days very nearly, as may be seen from Forbes, page 280. In Forbes's list, in fact, the hides are quoted at only $2.00 each. Mules cost even less than at Neve's time. If the reader, moreover, bears in mind that all missions together never owned more than 174,000 head of cattle at any period, he will know what to think of the assertion that annually 200,000 head of cattle were slaughtered at the missions. As to having sent money out of the territory, much less such preposterous amounts, for the benefit of the Church in Spain or Mexico or anywhere else, the charge is a stupid fabrication. With Bancroft we ask, "Where would the money come from?" Nor did the Mexican Government take away anything. We are thankful, however, to this man Hildrup for employing the right term for the act which the California freebooters dubbed "secularization." **Confiscation** is the appropriate word, as must be evident to the attentive reader. We just discover that the unsavory "Annals of San Francisco," as far back as 1854, also used the term **confiscation** for the act which its perpetrators heralded as mere secularization

G.

Land Grants in California.

(To Pages 386, 564.)

As soon as the territory of California was occupied by Spain in 1769 (we follow Bancroft, i, 607-608, in the main), the absolute title to the land vested in the king. No individual ownership of lands, but only usufructuary titles of various grades, existed in California during Spanish times. The king, however, was actually in possession of only the ground on which the presidios stood and of such adjoining lands as were needed in connection with the royal service. **The natives were recognized as the owners,** under the king, **of all the territory needed for their subsistence;** but the civilizing process to which they were to be subjected would greatly reduce the area from that occupied in their savage state; and thus there was no prospective legal hindrance to the establishment of Spanish settlements. The general laws of Spain, indeed, provided for such establishments of white people, and the assignment to each town of lands to the extent of four square leagues, but always without prejudice to the rights of the Indians, and therefore far enough away from either Indian missions or pagan rancherias.

Meanwhile the missionaries prepared their neophyte Indians to take possession as individuals of the lands they now held in common or as communities. Indeed the friars frequently advert to this ultimate aim of their temporal labors, though the progress was so slow that no time could be fixed for its accomplishment. When this stage of the civilizing process had been reached, and the missions had become regularly organized Indian towns governed by officials of their own choice and race, the church buildings and appurtenances would by right become the property of the Church under the Spanish law as they were in fact from the foundation of the missions, secular priests would take the places of the friar priests, and the latter would move on to new spiritual conquests among savages elsewhere, in order to pass through the same process with the same purpose. Four square leagues of land was the area to be assigned under ordinary circumstances to each of such civilized Indian pueblos, just as was the case with white settlements. The remainder of the land owned and cultivated by the late mission, as much as needed, would be held in common for agriculture and stock-raising as before, and the surplus was open to white settlers. The mission was then secularized in the true sense of the word, and in accordance with the Spanish laws and custom.

That the Spanish laws fully recognized the rights of the Indians to the soil and jealously protected the Indians against all encroach-

ments upon their lands, may be gathered from the following provisions contained in the "Recopilacion de Leyes de las Indias" or Collection of the Laws of the Indies. Book iv, title 12, law 9, reads: "We command that the residences and lands which may be granted to the Spaniards shall be so given as not to prejudice the Indians, and that those which have been granted to their prejudice and injury shall be returned to those to whom they lawfully belong."

Law 18 of the same book and title is in part as follows: "We order that the sale, grant and adjustment of lands be made with such care that the Indians may be left with even more than those tracts which belong to them, both as individuals and communities."

Law 10, title 17, of the same book, furthermore directs: "Let not our judges allow stock to be placed on farm lands of the Indians, and let them cause to be removed those that may be there, and let them impose and execute heavy penalties against those violating this provision." (See for a protest of the College of San Fernando against a violation of these laws vol. ii, pp. 517-518, this work. See also Case of Hart vs. Burnett, Land Titles in San Francisco, Notes 1 & 2.)

Malevolent writers, who merely repeat the slanders of the covetous paisano chiefs, charge that the missionaries "claimed all the land, extending their possessions from one extremity of the territory to the other, making the bounds of one mission form those of another, and fighting every grant made to an individual." This accusation is of a piece with another which asserts that the Fathers discouraged marriages of Spaniards with Indian girls. The answer to one will suffice to disprove the other. Having at heart the temporal as well as the eternal welfare of the Indians, the missionaries naturally sought to safeguard both. Hence they could not remain indifferent with regard to the character of those who desired to squat or to settle in the neighborhood of the mission establishments. People of quality to-day, even the very critics and traducers of the friars, do not admit into their society or into their neighborhood every one without distinction, nor will they allow their children to associate with the ill-bred or vicious. Why do not critics exercise, we shall not say charity, but a little judgment and common sense, and in the case of Catholic missionaries apply the rules by which they themselves wish to be judged? Why do they not put themselves in the place of the missionaries, and examine all the circumstances?

The missionaries in California, it will be remembered, under Spanish law stood to their Indian converts "in loco parentis," that is to say, they held the position, and were burdened with the responsibility, of parents. They were the guardians and stewards of

the lands and property of the Indians. As such, and in order to accomplish the purpose of Christianization and civilization, the friars had to prevent encroachments upon the property of the Indians and as far as possible preserve their neophyte wards from contamination. Hence it was that the friars strenuously, and justly so, objected to the granting of any Indian land to any one; and they especially objected to the granting of land near Indian settlements to vicious and idle adventurers, whether such land belonged to the missions, and consequently to the neophytes, or not. Beyond this the objection did not proceed, and so far it had to go in accordance with the Spanish laws as quoted before. Outside the mission boundaries there lay plenty of uncultivated lands which might be granted and were granted to those who applied for them under the laws of Spain, for Spain had laws for the colonization of bona fide settlers as well as the United States. Nay, even land belonging to the missions, and consequently to the Indians (not to the missionaries as unjust critics prate, for the friars did not claim nor could they claim an inch of ground for themselves), was granted to those who were entitled to such a grant for having married Indian mission girls, and the missionaries did not object, or if they objected it was on moral grounds. Indeed the very first grant of land, Indian land, to a white man was effected by Fr. Junípero Serra as far back as the year 1775. Though it may appear tedious reading, we herewith present the Expediente, that is to say the collection of all the papers concerning the case, of the first private land grant in Upper California. (See Dwinelle, "Addenda" No. LXXXV.)

"To Comandante Don Fernando Rivera:—I, Manuel Butron, a soldier of the army, at your feet earnestly supplicate that you may be pleased to grant me my discharge, and permit me to remain in this Mission, giving me that which His Majesty allows to every settler. I would also represent that the Rev. Missionary Fathers in the name of the Indians (I being married to Margarita, a daughter of the Mission), have assigned to me, and to all my descendants, a piece of land pertaining to said Mission, of the length and breadth of 140 varas, in the form of a perfect square, where at present I have corn planted, commencing the measurement at the first corner, and following the sides until the square is completed, under the condition of not being able to alienate it from the possession of my said descendants, or the children of the Mission, to which it must revert, in default of heirs, to me or my wife, jointly, or separately, by reason of the death of one of the two.

"The Missionary Fathers, in the name of said Indians, likewise agree that you, in the name of the King, our Sovereign, may give me the possession that is requisite and necessary. I also hope that

you will be pleased to assign me the land of the Royal Domain which, by order of His Majesty, I am entitled to.

"All of which I hope to receive from your favor and honor, and that God may preserve your life many years. Mission San Carlos de Monterey, November 12th, 1775. At the feet of Your Honor. Manuel Butron."

"Monterey, November 21st, 1775:—Don Fernando Rivera y Moncada, Captain, Comandante of this presidio and that of San Diego, by the authority of His Majesty (whom God preserve), and by virtue of the superior orders in my possession, for the exercise of my authority, and also for the establishment of a Fort and Mission in the Port of San Francisco.—

"To whom the foregoing was presented, orders that an official communication in relation to the matter, be required from the Rev. Fr. Junípero Serra, Presidente of the Missions. Thus I provided, ordered, and signed with two witnesses, with whom I act, to which I attest.

Fernando de Rivera y Moncada.

Hermenegildo Sal.
Antonio Joseph Patron."

"Official Communication to Said Father:

"Most Rev. Father, Fr. Junípero Serra: My dear Sir:—I transmit to Your Reverence the information that Manuel Butron has presented me a petition in which he asks his discharge as a soldier, and the possession of 140 varas square of land, which he says Your Reverence assigned him in the name of the Indians of that Mission, on account of his being married to one of the daughters of said Mission; and I hope Your Reverence will have the kindness to advise me if such is the fact, so that the necessary proceedings may be had. I shall rejoice to hear of the good health of Your Reverence, and placing myself at your disposition, I pray that the Lord preserve Your Reverence many years. Monterey, November 21st, 1775. Fernando de Rivera y Moncada."

"In said presidio, on the 22nd of November of the aforesaid year, I, the said Comandante, having forwarded the foregoing official communication to the Fr. Presidente, he replied to the same in the following terms:

"Señor Capitan Comandante, Don Fernando Rivera y Moncada:

"My dear Sir:—In reply to yours of the date of yesterday, the 21st instant, in relation to the matter of Manuel Butron, I have to say that it is true, as he has informed you in his petition, that we, the Missionaries of this Mission of San Carlos, in the name of the natives composing the same, assigned to said Butron, in virtue of the right of his wife, Margarita, who is one of the natives of said Mission, 140 varas square of land, on the place at which he has corn

planted at this time, in order that said family and the descendants thereof may possess the same in accordance with the Royal Orders; that they shall not be able to sell, donate, or alienate the same to others beyond the children or descendants of said Mission. Wherefore, so far as we are concerned in the matter, you can, in the name of Royal Justice, give the desired possession; this is not to be reckoned or included in the allotment of the Royal Domain that the Supreme Authority may determine to make to similar families of settlers, among which to you and to the other Officials of the King, our Sovereign, we recommend this family as being the first in all these establishments which has chosen to become a permanent settler of the same; a circumstance which has also influenced us in assigning him a place so commodious and conveniently situated as that which we have allotted to him. I trust that you may continue in the enjoyment of perfect health, and that you will command me in whatever I can serve you. Pray, in the meantime, that God may extend to me the blessing of His Divine Grace. Mission San Carlos, November 22nd, 1775. Fr. Junípero Serra."

"The free consent of the Rev. Missionary Fathers having been shown, I order that the proceedings continue; thus I provided, ordered, and signed, with those of my assistance.

Fernando de Rivera y Moncada.

Hermenegildo Sal.

Antonio Joseph Patron."

"Monterey, November 27th, 1775. For the conclusion of these proceedings, I went to-day to the Mission of Carmelo, and with the assistance of the Rev. Father Fr. Junípero Serra, Presidente of the Missions, and of the party interested, Manuel Butron, the Corporal Hermenegildo Sal and my own, there were measured the 140 varas square of land, running the lines from north to south, and from east to west, and placing a stake at each corner, and the interested party being informed as to the manner of establishing boundaries, I retired; leaving the said Manuel Butron and his wife, Margarita Maria, and their descendants in Royal and legitimate possession of the said 140 varas square of land, in which act I have proceeded by virtue of the authority conferred on me the 17th of August, 1773, by His Excellency, Señor Don Antonio Bucareli y Ursúa, Viceroy, Governor and Captain-General of this Kingdom. It being understood as applicable, not alone to this class of persons, but also to the natives of the country. Not being in possession of a copy of the 'Recopilacion,' I have solicited the Rev. Fathers for the same to serve me as a guide in these matters, but have failed to obtain it." (The Fathers at that time had no copy; but later it is evidence in disputes with subsequent officials.) "Wherefore I supplicate the Justices of His Majesty

that may succeed me that they may hold and recognize, for all time, this possession as legitimate and valid, and that they may consider as expressed all the formalities and requisites that the laws provide. In order that it may now and forever hereafter have its due validity, force, and strength, I sign it with two witnesses, with whom I act, for want of a Royal Public Notary, and on this ordinary paper, for want of that which bears seal. In witness thereof,

Fernando de Rivera y Moncada.

Hermenegildo Sal.
Antonio Joseph Patron."

On the other hand, the missionaries, like the watchful guardians they were, would manifest their solicitude for their wards by objecting to land grants when such concessions were not in accordance with the intent of the royal laws, that is to say, when they encroached on the rights and the welfare of the Indians, whether pagans or neophytes. A case in point, which became somewhat notorious, was the application, the second on record, of Francisco Cayuelas, a retired corporal, who had married an Indian neophyte. It is well to follow the documentary evidence, as is our custom.

"It having been determined," writes Governor Pedro Fages to Fr. Presidente Fermín de Lasuén, July 13th, 1790, "by the superior authority, (i. e. Ugarte, the Comandante-General), to award a lot and lands to Corporal Francisco Cayuelas, retired, within the boundaries of Mission San Luis Obispo, without prejudice to the Indians, in virtue of the right possessed by his wife as neophyte of said Mission, in conformity with the instruction given me for that purpose and for other cases of the same nature that may arise; and, inasmuch as it seems to me that the site called Santa Margarita is suitable for settling this individual as well as others in his circumstances, because the cañon and the mountain pass that lie between will prevent the damage that might otherwise be done to both sides by cattle, I have notified the Rev. Fr. Miguel Giribet of it, and to Your Reverence I communicate it for your proper information, and that at a convenient time I will give orders that the superior ordinances be executed."

According to the law in such cases the land must not be needed by the mission, and the missionary as guardian of the neophytes of the respective mission, had to give his consent. Fages overlooked this essential formality, and selected and conceded neophyte land without as much as consulting the missionary. What Fr. Giribet's action was, we do not know; but Fr. Presidente Lasuén, as Superior of all the missions, at once interposed his objection, as will be seen from the following curtailed reply of July 26th.

". . . The letter of Your Honor of the 13th instant surely is not intended to obtain my consent, inasmuch as the matter has

already been decided. In case, however, that my consent were needed, I could not give it. If Your Honor communicates this to me only that I should be informed, I understand; but if it be that I should express my opinion, it is as follows. As soon as Cayuelas had married the said neophyte, which happened very soon after she was baptized, he took her out of that community, and made her entirely independent of that Mission and of the guidance of its missionaries. (In so doing she severed her connection with the mission, and thus forfeited her rights, if indeed she had any, for being but a new-comer.) He took her away and separated her from contributing in the least to the benefit and utility of the land. Hence, those who have deserved well of the mission, and have given their services along with their submission and continual labor in favor of the common good, will be wronged through said grant and their descendants after them, when at some day there will be question of distributing those lands, ("cuando algun dia se trate de repartirles las tierras." Thus the Fathers always looked forward to the distribution of the land in severalty to the owners), which at the cost of indescribable hardships the Indians made productive and profitable for rational society, so much so that those who are converted and those who shall be converted may be able to subsist with comfort on the common property while living together as neophytes at the mission, and afterwards in due time, when each receives his share from which they may make their living and manage their own affairs as Pueblo Indians. Nothing of this has been observed by Cayuelas.

"Moreover, Señor, Mission San Luis Obispo is utilizing the place called Santa Margarita for many purposes, one of which is the raising and herding of swine.

"Furthermore at this place there is a ranchería of pagan Indians, many of whose members are Christians at said Mission.

"It is also to be remarked that the long distance and bad roads from said mission to said place will place Cayuelas as well as those who with him want to take possession of such land in danger, and in case of mishap the missionaries will be put to intolerable hardship attending such settlers. I pass over for the present the likelihood that the place may become a bawdry and a haunt for both neophytes and vicious pagans with pernicious results."

Fr. Lasuén closed his lengthy representation by telling the governor that he would submit to the action of the government, but would report the matter to the College of San Fernando, which of course would present Fr. Lasuén's arguments to the viceroy. It seems the viceroy thereupon revoked the grant; at all events San Luis Obispo Mission retained possession of the Santa Margarita district down to the time of the confiscation.

It is unnecessary to dwell further on the practice of the mis-

sionaries in such cases. Evidently they were within their rights, and only complied with their obligation to their wards, whenever they refused to agree to any cession of land that belonged to the Indians, unless such cession of land was in accordance with the intent of the laws which always stood on the side of the natives. It may be said in passing that down to the year 1800 as many as twenty-nine neophyte girls or women had married white men, which was a large percentage considering the small white population, for many of the soldiers brought their wives along from Mexico.

With regard to the ridiculous charge that the missions owned all the land from one missionary establishment to the other, it is sufficient to enumerate the ranches occupied by white men outside the mission boundaries. A few introductory remarks will, however, be necessary.

When appointed comandante of the San Diego and Monterey presidios in Upper California, Don Fernando Rivera, on August 17th, 1773, received instructions from Viceroy Bucareli to make a beginning of future settlements by distributing lands to such persons, either natives or Spaniards, as might be worthy and would devote themselves to agriculture and stock-raising. It was in virtue of this order that Manuel Butron received his grant of land in 1775. In November, 1777, the town of San José was founded and land assigned to the settlers. Under the regulation of Governor Neve Los Angeles was established in 1781.

In 1784 application was made to Governor Pedro Fages by private individuals for grants of ranchos. He in that year made two large grants. One was to Manuel Nieto for a place called Santa Gertrudis or Los Nietos. It comprised 300,000 acres or sixty-eight square leagues. Here one family received more land than was held by entire missions, and none of the Californians objected. Good Fr. Sánchez of San Gabriel, however, protested, and showed that, besides being Indian land, it was needed by Mission San Gabriel. At all events, how could one white family prove that it needed sixty-eight square leagues? We do not find Hittel or similar friends (?) of the Indians making any remarks on the injustice of such a transaction; but they do keep on carping at the missionaries for defending the rights of the Indians, though they do not put it in that way. Such writers conceal their animosity by accusing the friars of acting through personal selfishness! The result of the protest was that at least a part of this land returned to the owners, the neophytes of the mission, as will be related in the local history of San Gabriel. Another large grant was in the same year made to José Maria Verdúgo for a tract known as San Rafael in what is now Los Angeles County. It contained over 34,000 acres or eight square leagues! The next large grants were

made in or about 1795, one to Patricio Javier Pico and Miguel Pico for a stretch of land called San José de Grácia or Simí, containing nearly 100,000 acres in Ventura County, and one to José Darío Argüello for an indefinite tract of land known as El Pilár on the ocean coast between Point San Pedro and Point Año Nuevo. (See Hittell, ii, 748; Bancroft, i, 609-612.) In 1802 Viceroy Marquina conceded to Mariano Castro Las Animas or Sítio de la Brea in Santa Clara County. It comprised 24,000 acres of land! In the same year Governor Arrillaga granted upwards of 60,000 acres of the Paraje de Santiago in what is Los Angeles County to Antonio Yorba and others in confirmation of a previous grant imperfectly made in 1801. In 1813 Governor Arrillaga granted to José Ortega and others the tract called Nuestra Señora del Refúgio or Refúgio Rancho consisting of six square leagues on the Santa Barbara Channel in Santa Barbara County. About 1814 Governor José Darío Argüello allowed Antonio Maria Lugo to take up 30,000 acres in Los Angeles County. The locality was called San Antonio. Between 1817 and 1822 Governor Solá made several grants. One was to Juan José Domínguez for over 40,000 acres. This stretch, known as San Pedro, was in Los Angeles County. Another grant was to Ignacio Vallejo and others for two square leagues called Bolsa de San Cayetano in Santa Barbara County. Antonio Maria Castro received some 4,000 acres at Vega del Rio del Pájaro in Monterey County. Luis Peralta came in for about eleven square leagues called San Antonio in Alameda County. Finally José Higuera obtained about 4,000 acres called Los Tularcitos in Santa Clara County. (See Hittell, ii, 749). It will be observed that these grants date from Spanish times, before the Mexican independence. What happened under Mexican rule will be reserved for the local history of each mission.

Comandante-General Jacobo Ugarte in 1786 authorized granting tracts not to exceed three leagues, four leagues away from any existing pueblo, and always without prejudice to the missions or Indian rancherías. Governor Borica, writing to the viceroy in 1795, did not favor such grants. It would be difficult, he said, to tell what lands the missions really needed, since converts were constantly coming in; troubles between the owners of ranchos and ranchería Indians would lead to excesses and war; the animals of settlers would do injury to the food-supply of the gentiles; and the rancheros or white settlers would be far removed from spiritual care and from judicial supervision. Borica had some experience in the matter; for in 1795 there were about sixteen ranchos in the regions of Los Angeles and Monterey held provisionally by about twenty men. (See Bancroft, i, 611-612.)

Enough. It is plain the charge that the "Fathers" or "Padres" claimed all the land from one extremity of the territory to the

other, and that they made the bounds of one mission form those of another in order to exclude any white settlers, must proceed from wilful ignorance or from unreasoning bigotry.

H.

Las Memorias or Invoice of Goods Annually Forwarded to Each Mission. (Sample List.)

(To Pages 74 and 424.)

From the contents of this Memoria for Mission Santa Barbara for the year 1804 the reader will understand how eagerly both missionaries and Indians must have looked for the arrival of the vessel from San Blas. The feeling was akin to the expectations of our present day children for the Feast of Christmas. When after 1811 these goods ceased to come and the neophytes had to be content with what could be raised or manufactured at the missions, we can imagine the wistful countenances of the Indians and the heartache of the missionaries with whose stipends and with the drafts received for mission products sold to the soldiers and others the goods had been procured. The friars generally indicated the articles they desired. These were then purchased by the college procurator, charged up to the respective mission and paid with the said stipends from the Pious Fund or with drafts on the royal treasury. The invoice with the price of each article annexed was transmitted to the missionary in charge. Here follows a sample list.

			Credit	
	Pesos	Reáles	Pesos	Reáles
"In the first place I book $403 and 7 reáles, transmitted to this mission last year by Don Estéban Lazcano	403	7		
3 Ordos (printed directories) sent by mail in July	1	4		
1 barrel of grape wine for holy Mass	34	1		
1 barrel of refined brandy	34	3		
4 arrobas of fine chocolate (arroba 25 lbs)	36			
4 arrobas superfine chocolate	48	6		
4 arrobas ordinary chocolate	19	4		
2 arrobas of prepared wax	59			

	Pesos	Reáles	Credit Pesos	Credit Reáles
1 arroba of anise	7			
3 bottles of table oil	12	6		
2 bolts of blue flannel	106			
8 bolts of wide calico	72			
1 bolt of striped calico	10	7		
1 bolt of pure white bramante (linen)	37	4½		
2 pieces of wide French linen	24			
1 bolt of Querétaro cloth	58	1½		
2 habits, cords, 2 cowls, and 3 tunics	42	2		
12 lbs. of wicks	10			
12 lbs. of twine or string	6			
18 ordinary hats	15			
12 gross of Rosaries and 2 gross of crosses	9			
12 bundles of tobacco	9			
1 can of snuff	11	2		
1 ream of fine paper	7			
8 fine China handkerchiefs	13			
6 pieces of tape	3	3½		
1 gross of fire-crackers	3			
1 gross of running fire or serpents, 4 wheels	3	4		
6 dozen of carretillas (probably another species of fireworks)	12			
10 dollars worth of soap	10			
24 bundles of blue glass beads	28	4		
2 silver candlesticks for St. Joseph	73	4		
1 carved statue of St. Michael, 6 spans high	58			
1 similar statue of the Angel Guardian	63			
1 bass drum	10			
1 bandola (musical instrument)	8			
1 set of strings for violin and guitar	10	6		
8 ounces of saffron	7	3		
12 pair of scissors for the dressmakers	8			
2 lbs. violet ochre, 2 lbs. yellow ochre, and 2 lbs. red ochre	1			
8 ounces of vermillion	6			
3 bottles of linseed oil	4			
2 lbs. of Isis ointment	2			
2 lbs. yellow ointment and 2 lbs. of mallow	3	2		
1 lb. of ointment for hernia	2			
2 lbs. of balsam	1	4		
2 lbs. of verdigris	3	4		
12 lbs. of viper-root	2	6		

	Pesos	Reáles	Credit Pesos	Credit Reáles
2 bottles of sweet almond oil	4	5		
6 small jars of genuine bitter elixir	9	7		
500 iron spikes	6	4		
500 iron spikes half-size	4	4		
50 door hinges	10	3½		
50 window hinges	5	2		
24 steel-edged hoes (12 of them Vizcayan)	42	5		
16 plow shares	40	2		
4 steel axes	6	4		
6 strong horse bridles	9			
12 strong spurs	18			
24 iron frames for saddles	33			
6 cutlasses	13	4		
12 assorted augers	3	4		
12 chisels of all sizes	13			
6 paring chisels, different sizes	2	2		
6 locks for single doors	10	4		
Bottoms for 3 large iron kettles, with rivets	119	3½		
2 tinned kettles, medium size	16	2		
6 flat pans of iron	18			
2 dozen sickles	9			
1 dozen wool cards	30			
6 large cartwright augers	4	4		
4 assorted iron pots	45			
4 iron frying pans	7	4		
1 cope of silk stuff with raised flowers	83	2		
1 frontal (for the altar), red, of same material	44			
2 shawls, one of silk, the other of cotton	8			
2 black middling-fine hats	12			
1 piece of cotton print for skirts	6	6		
3 yds. of gold galloons for trousers	4			
6 artificial flower bouquets for the altar	15			
2 small iron pots	12	3		
12 cornucopias with golden designs	28	4		
1 fine tapestry "de tres ordenes"	14			
24 large knives	6			
1 box of vestments, sacred vessels, etc., as enumerated on enclosed list	244			
6 arrobas and 6 lbs. of "fierro platina"	21	6		
24 saddle girths, 4 calf skin coverings, 2 pack saddle coverings, 3 bundles of seed sacks	7	6		
11 boxes in which part of this cargo goes	9	5		

			Credit	
	Pesos	Reáles	Pesos	Reáles
15 bundles of leather bags at 6 reales.....	11	2		
18 bundles of pack-cloth, ropes, mats, bags, etc.	27			
Charges of $210 and 2 reales for the freight for 140 arrobas and 4 lbs., the weight of the goods for this Mission, at 12 reales the arroba 210		2		
Credit of $75 and 2 reales due from the account of last year.....			75	6
Credit for $300 received last year by Don Estéban Lazcano from the mission.....			300	
Credit for $1411, 5½ reales, received in favor of this mission by Don Raymundo Carrillo on December 31st, 1803.....			1411	5½
Payment of the stipend from the Pious Fund for the two missionaries, due September 30th, 1804			800	
	$2661	5	2587	3½
	2587	3½		
Balance - - - - -	$ 74	1½		

As shown on the margin this mission owes $74, 1½ reales. In testimony of which I sign it here at San Fernando de Mexico, on February 21st, 1805. Fr. Thomás de la Peña."

I.

Two Sandwich Island Exiles, Victims of Bigotry.

(To Pages 478 and 482.)

It was on January 21st, 1832, that the brig **Waverly,** Captain William Sumner, from Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, entered the desolate Bay of San Pedro, anchored, and landed two passengers on the barren strand with but two bottles of water and one biscuit. Here, more than thirty miles from any habitation, save a small hut two leagues away, the unfortunate men passed a sleepless night. An Indian, who next morning happened to stroll along in search of shells, discovered them, and notified the missionary of San Gabriel.

The Father welcomed as brothers the two strangers who turned out to be the Very Rev. J. A. Bachelot, prefect apostolic of the Sandwich Islands, and Rev. Patrick Short. Both priests were members of the Congregation of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, or Picpus Fathers. In 1827 they had been sent from France to preach the Gospel to the natives in the Sandwich Islands. Unfortunately for their work, in 1820 some bitterly hostile Calvinistic preachers from New England had preceded them. These American



Signature of Very Rev. Alejo Bachelot.

preachers had ingratiated themselves with the native King Kaahuamanu, who at their instigation ordered the two priests to be banished.

Fr. Narciso Durán, the vicario foraneo of the bishop for California, gladly permitted them to exercise the ministry in the territory. Very Rev. Bachelot was stationed at Los Angeles, and Rev. P. Short soon came up to Monterey, where in company with Hartnell he conducted a school. The two priests labored in harmony with the Franciscans until April 1837, when, to the regret of the friars and the people, both sailed away in the English brig **Clementine** in order once more to try to secure a foothold in the Sandwich Islands. The Rev. Robert Walsh of the same Society of Picpus had arrived at Honolulu on September 30th, 1836. As a British subject the authorities dared not deport him, but he was not allowed to preach to the natives. When the two Fathers came from California they were harassed and ill-treated until they resolved to depart. Rev. Short on October 30th, 1837, departed for Valparaiso.



Signature of Rev. Patrick Short.

A Rev. Maigret of the same Society reached the harbor of Honolulu on November 2nd, 1837, but he was not permitted to set foot on land. With Rev. Bachelot he therefore purchased the **Honolulu,**

a small old vessel of thirty-nine tons. Rev. Bachelot, emaciated and his reason impaired, was assisted to embark on November 23rd. The ship sailed immediately, and eleven days later the noble missionary and victim of senseless bigotry breathed his last. "The power and grace of God (?) have hitherto preserved us from these ravening wolves," unctuously wrote one of the so-called Christian preachers to his New England employers. As ravening wolves they certainly did treat the poor priests. The body of Rev. Bachelot was happily preserved and given burial on Ascension Island. An humble monument marked the grave. After freedom of worship in 1839 had been forced from the deluded king by Captain Laplace of the French frigate **L'Artemise,** Rev. Maigret and other Picpus Fathers returned to the Sandwich Islands, where the Rev. Maigret became vicar apostolic. ("History of the Catholic Religion in the Sandwich Islands, 1829-1841." Reprinted at San Francisco in July 1897. Mofras, ii, 293-295; Mission Records of San Gabriel, Los Angeles, and Monterey; Bancroft, iii, 317-318.)

J.

STATE OF THE MISSIONS ON DECEMBER 31, 1832.

Name of the Mission.	Founded.	Baptisms.	Marriages.	Deaths.	Neophytes.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Goats.	Swine.	Horses.	Mules.
San Diego	July 16,1769.	6,522	1,794	4,322	1,455	4,500	13,250	150		220	80
San Luis Rey	June 13,1798.	5,399	1,335	2,718	2,788	27,500	26,100	1,300	300	1,950	180
San Juan Capistrano	Nov. 1, 1776.	4,340	1,153	3,126	900	10,900	4,800	50	40	450	30
San Gabriel	Sept.8, 1771.	7,825	1,916	5,670	1,320	16,500	8,500	40	60	1,200	42
San Fernando	Sept.8, 1797.	2,784	827	1,983	782	7,000	1,000			1,000	60
San Buenaventura	March31,1782.	3,875	1,097	3,150	668	4,050	3,000	16	290	200	60
Santa Barbara	Dec. 4, 1786.	5,556	1,486	3,936	628	1,800	3,200	28	64	480	135
Santa Inés	Sept.17,1804.	1,348	400	1,227	360	7,200	2,100		60	390	110
Purisima Concepcion	Dec. 8, 1787.	3,255	1,029	2,609	372	9,200	3,500	20	65	1,000	200
San Luis Obispo	Sept. 1,1772.	2,644	763	2,268	231	2,500	5,422			700	200
San Miguel	July 25,1797.	2,471	764	1,868	658	3,710	8,282	42	50	700	186
San Antonio	July 14,1771.	4,419	1,142	3,617	640	6,000	10,500	65	70	774	82
N.Sra.de la Soledad	Oct. 9, 1791.	2,131	648	1,705	339	6,000	6,200			252	56
San Carlos	June 3, 1770.	3,827	1,032	2,837	185	2,100	3,300			410	8
San Juan Bautista	June 24,1797.	4,016	1,003	2,854	916	6,000	6,004		20	296	13
Santa Cruz	Aug. 28.1791.	2,439	827	1,972	284	3,600	5,211			400	25
Santa Clara	Jan. 12.1777.	8,536	2,498	6,809	1,125	10,000	9,500		55	730	35
San José	June 11.1797.	6.673	1,990	4,800	1,800	12,000	11,000		40	1,100	40
San Francisco de Asis	Oct. 8, 1776.	6,898	2,043	5,166	204	5,000	3,500			1,000	18
San Rafael	Dec. 14,1817.	1,821	519	652	300	2,120	3,000			370	2
San Francisco Solano	July 4, 1823.	1,008	263	500	996	3,500	600		50	900	13
		87,787	24,529	63,789	16,951	151,180	137,971	1,711	1,164	14,522	1,575

At the end of December 1834 the Mission Registers have the following account in round numbers:
89,800 Baptisms, 25,250 Marriages, 66,100 Deaths, and 15,400 Neophytes.

K.

Alleged Wanton Slaughter of Mission Cattle.

(To Page 558.)

"In the meantime, with the energy born of despair, eager at any cost to outwit those who sought to profit by their ruin, the mission fathers hastened to destroy that which through more than half a century thousands of human beings had spent their lives to accumulate. Hitherto cattle had been killed only as their meat was needed for use, or, at intervals, perhaps, for the hides and tallow alone, when an overplus of stock rendered such action necessary. Now they were slaughtered in herds by contract on equal shares with any one who would undertake the task. It is claimed by some writers that not less than 100,000 head of cattle were thus slain from the herds of San Gabriel alone. The same work of destruction was in progress at every other mission throughout the territory, and this vast country from end to end, was become a mighty shambles, drenched in blood and reeking with the odor of decaying carcasses."

No, dear reader, this is no part of a spread-eagle campaign speech. It is taken from page 68 of "Southern California" and page 99 of the "Central Coast," both having as sub-title "Historical and Biographical Record, by Prof. J. M. Guinn, A. M., Author of A History of Los Angeles and Vicinity, History of Southern California, Secretary and Curator of the Historical Society of Southern California, Member of the American Historical Association, Washington, D. C." One should think that all these titles would insure against—well, let us put it mildly—erroneous statements, the more so as the author in his preface writes: "In narrating the story of California, I have endeavored to deal justly with the different eras and episodes of its history; to state facts; to tell the truth without favoritism or prejudice; to give credit where credit is due and blame where it is deserved. In the preparation of this history I have tried to make it readable." Let us see.

The first-named work is a bulky tome weighing eleven pounds and containing 1295 royal quarto pages. On eighty-five pages the author essays to give a history of California and the missions; eighty-eight pages are devoted to the local history of the southern counties, and on 1089 all those are canonized alive who contributed at the rate of $25 per page. As the dead missionaries found no one to advance that amount or any part of it, they could, of course, not expect to receive the halo at the hands of the biographical sketcher who just tells the truth "without prejudice." The general history contained in the second and smaller work is but a duplicate of the first, as far as the missionaries are concerned.

The author says he tried to make the book "readable," that means he threw in enough fiction to gratify the most imaginative romancer. At all events, the paragraph quoted from his alleged history regarding the wanton destruction of property and slaughter of cattle by the mission Fathers is pure fiction. This may be proved by his own statement as found on page 47 of the eleven pounder and on page 58 of the smaller work. There he says: "The number of cattle belonging to San Gabriel in 1830 was 25,725." That is nearly true, for the exact figures in the official returns are 23,500 head. At the close of 1829 there were 25,000, or within 1300 of the highest number ever owned by that mission, i. e. 26,300. In 1831 the mission possessed 20,500, a decrease of 3000 from the previous year. In 1832, the last of which there exist official returns, there were 16,500, a decrease of 4000. It will be observed that since 1828 the herds steadily decreased. This may be accounted for by the slaughter for weekly consumption which required between fifty and sixty head a week, by the theft of cattle on the part of savages, and by destruction through wild beasts. The carelessness of the steadily decreasing mission Indians doubtless also was cause of much loss of stock. At any rate, how could 100,000 cattle be slaughtered at San Gabriel alone when that mission never owned more than one-fourth that number in any one year? Nay, in 1832 the twenty-one missions of California together possessed only 151,180 head of cattle, and the number was still dwindling because there was at each mission only one missionary who had grown feeble with age and hardships, and who through the machinations of the mission enemies no more enjoyed full control of the neophytes so as to keep the estates in repair and the herds in condition. Indeed the twenty-one missions together never owned more than 174,000 head of cattle in any one year, and that was in 1828. How then in the year of the alleged wanton slaughter, 1834, could 100,000 be killed at one mission alone?

This explodes the assertion of Guinn that California from one end to the other "was become a mighty shambles, etc." We might have expected as much; for when we found him, three chapters back, expatiating on "the shackles of creed and the fetters of priestcraft," we were convinced that this writer "without prejudice" knew not what he was talking about, and yet had not wisdom enough to hide his ignorance by keeping silent. A religion without creed is arithmetic without the multiplication table, and a religion without clergy or priests is a school without a teacher. One is as crazy a condition as the other. Having been a public school teacher the author "without prejudice" will be able to appreciate that much. Wicked boys, of course, have no love for the conscientious teacher, not any more than wicked adults have for the law and its representatives. People of sense, however,

leave railing at teachers and laws and courts to the vicious. By this time Guinn will have learned what "priestcraft" is. He knew not before. It is stating the truth and exposing falsehood. Of any other priestcraft we know nothing.

Guinn does not mention his authorities, but we fancy Hittell to be one of them. By means of some juggling, or let us say through misunderstanding, he somehow managed to reach the 100,000 at one mission alone. Hittell writes: "The missions at the beginning of 1834 contained upwards of 30,000 neophytes; they had upwards of 420,000 cattle, over 60,000 horses and mules, and over 320,000 sheep, goats, and hogs." (ii, p. 207.) We have the official returns before us and they read for the close of 1832 as follows: 17,470 neophytes, 152,580 cattle, 16,875 horses and mules, 140,923 sheep. After this date Indians and herds decreased. "In 1834," says Hittell, "the missions slaughtered about 100,000 cattle," (so not at one mission alone, as Guinn dreams) "about twice as many as usual." This too is fiction. Nevertheless we shall allow these closet historians to kill off in addition the 268,000 grazing in their fertile imagination so as to come down to the reality, 152,580 cattle in existence at the missions in 1832, and allow that to be the improbable number in 1834. We shall now examine what happened in reality at the time of the "grand slaughter." Happily we can trace the source of these stories. They originated with Antonio M. Ósio, Pio Pico, J. M. Estudillo, Jr., and Juan Bandini, all, save Estudillo Jr., members of the gang that engineered the confiscation of the missions, consequently bitter enemies of the missionaries, and of whose writings Bancroft (iv, 762) affirms that "none of them, nor all combined, would be a safe guide in the absence of the original records." For a wonder Mariano Vallejo and J. B. Alvarado are entirely silent on the subject, which of itself is excellent proof that no extraordinary slaughter took place, at least not in the missions of the north. Antonio M. Ósio in the notes written for Bancroft says: "It is not my intention to put any blemish on the conduct of those Rev. Fathers when I relate no more than the facts, concerning which if any proofs are asked the first one would be the general dissatisfaction; and the second an order from the Fr. Prefecto to the Father of Mission San Luis Obispo, in which he told him to see how he could destroy the property of the mission as quickly as possible (una orden del Prefecto al Padre de la Mision de San Luis Obispo, en que le decia viera como podia destruir los intereses de la Mision lo mas breve posible), and that the Indians should have the benefit of it. The Father considered the matter for several days, and finally, believing that he had hit the mark of his Prelate's wishes, he made a purchase exceeding the value of $20,000 in fine goods of cotton, woolen, and silken cloths, which he distributed among his neo-

phytes so that they might clothe themselves therewith. The third proof is that other missions hastened to slaughter cattle for the sake of the hides alone, and inasmuch as it seemed to them that they had not sufficient hands to finish quickly, they gave the job in partnership to several persons, each to share in half the hides and the mission to receive the other half. These men left the fat and flesh on the ground to rot in the field in 1832-1834. The hides were shipped from the port of San Pedro. According to a reasonable calculation of the merchants who received them, the number of hides taken was more than 5000 of the cattle belonging to San Gabriel."

Such is the story of Ósio on the subject. As proofs he gives the general dissatisfaction of the friars, which is no proof at all. Excepting the paisano chiefs, the whole territory was dissatisfied, as we know from M. Vallejo himself. Next in evidence he adduces an alleged order of the Fr. Prefecto of all the missions for the destruction of property. If the friars had been as little conscientious as the paisano chiefs, some probability for such an order might be inferred, but as the missionaries had some regard for the Seventh Commandment of God the charge is absurd. At all events, there is not a shred of proof that any such order was issued. Next, if the missionary in charge of San Luis expended $20,000 to clothe his neophytes, he did the right thing, and if he added some finery for the children and female portion of the flock, he acted wisely and fatherly; but in order to be able to obtain $20,000 he would have had to slaughter 10,000 head of cattle. Mission San Luis Obispo, however, never possessed more than 8900 cattle, and that was in 1818. In 1832 it owned only 2500! At this mission, then, no extraordinary slaughter occurred, or we should have some record of it. As to San Gabriel we shall let Ósio's statement of a slaughter of 5000 cattle at San Gabriel pass. 3000 head a year were needed to feed the neophytes. If the missionary had an additional 5000 head killed in order to procure clothing, etc., for his Indians, what of it after all? It was Indian property; but there is no other evidence than the unsupported assertions of Ósio and the covetous clique that feared to have the prey escape its clutches.

Next we have the statement of Juan Bandini of the "Cosmopolitana" swindling colonization scheme. "Bandini tells us," Bancroft contemptuously says (iii, 349), "that 2000 cattle were killed in a single day at one mission" (which he does not name), "the fat and meat being left in the fields. Figueroa's government only pretended to interfere to save a portion of the stock for a particular purpose indicated in a letter to friends in Mexico, which the author saw, but which he takes good care not to quote or explain."

Bandini's charge, then, is of no value until he names the mission and the time.

Estudillo Jr., Bancroft writes, "tells us that after a time nothing but hides was saved. Some 20,000 head were killed at the San Jacinto ranch of San Luis Rey." Since Estudillo fails to inform us as to who ordered the slaughter or in what year it took place, and who performed the task, his assertion is nothing but bald assertion, and therefore worthless.

Finally there is Pio Pico, the chief of the paisano conspirators against the missions and missionaries. "In 1833," he claims, "I was working at the Rancho San José of Mission San Luis Rey slaughtering cattle for half shares with the mission. My contract with the Fathers had no limits. I was to kill as many head of cattle as I could, but to turn over one-half of the hides. I brought ten cowboys and thirty Indians on foot from the missions of San Luis Rey and San Diego with more than 300 horses. I first slaughtered 2500 head at the Coyotes rancho. Then I moved over to that of San José rancho and killed about the same number." Pico is not specific. It is difficult to see which mission herds he means. However, we shall suppose the 5000 cattle he killed belonged to San Luis Rey, as seems to be the case. These with the 5000 Ósio claims were killed at San Gabriel amount to 10,000 head, which is far from the 100,000 Hittell and his copyists let the Fathers kill in one year. It is true that Pico adds the remark: "These slaughters were done by contract and they were general at the missions of the south for the reason that it had come to the hearing of the Fathers that the government was thinking of secularizing the missions. At some of these in the south they not only killed cattle in vast numbers, but they destroyed the vineyards which formerly they had cultivated with the greatest care." (Pico's Notes, Bancroft Collection.)

The mission enemies themselves do not furnish evidence that an unusual number of cattle were killed in any mission outside of San Gabriel and San Luis Rey, and even at these two missions together Pico and his fellow conspirators cannot prove a larger number than 10,000, and in the killing of one-half of these Pico himself was particeps criminis (partner in the crime) and beneficiary, if there was any fault in the transaction at all. With regard to the wanton destruction of vineyards for the motive alleged, it is too absurd to refute; but it will be refuted presently, nevertheless.

The mission enemies profess to find some proof in the action of the legislative assembly which in June 1834 forbade the slaughter of cattle except in the usual quantities, and by members of the community. The notorious assembly, which also passed the act of confiscation, later directed Gov. Figueroa to address the following noti-

fication to Fr. Narciso Durán, presidente of the Fernandinos, and to Fr. García Diego, prefect of the Zacatecan Fathers: "The great slaughter of cattle that has been done in various missions, and the destructive manner in which it has been performed to the public scandal, has attracted the attention of the Illustrious Territorial Deputation. Desirous of preventing so much waste, and making use of its jurisdiction, it has resolved on the 12th of the present month as follows:

"1. The unusued tracts of mission lands shall be distributed according to the laws of colonization.

"2. The Hon. Governor shall suspend the extensive slaughter of cattle which is being carried on at the missions, and he shall permit it only when informed of the urgent necessity.

"3. In case it is permitted, it is forbidden to the Rev. Fathers to order the slaughter to be done through people who do not belong to the community.

"By order of the said Deputation I communicate this to Your Reverences in order that it may have its fulfillment at the missions under your charge with the remark that under this date I communicate this order directly to the missionaries of San Luis Rey, San Gabriel, and Purisima so that they may suspend the slaughter they are carrying on now. Monterey, June 16th, 1834." ("Cal. Arch.," Dep. St. Pap., Los Angeles, Off. Cor. p. 133; Records, Clerk's Office, Santa Cruz County, Book A; Bancroft Collection, Archives of Santa Cruz, pp. 10-11, University, Berkeley.)

Without delay Fr. Vicente Pascual Oliva of San Luis Rey replied under date of July 2nd, 1834, as follows: "In response to the official note, which Your Honor has been pleased to direct to me under date of June 16th of the current year, I cannot do less than present to Your Honor the following facts: This mission was in great need of clothing, and not having any other means of covering the debts contracted with various ships, the mission availed itself of the slaughter of cattle. This is being done by two persons of honorable conduct in every way. They kill only the old and wild or unbranded cattle. They also use their own horses in the round up and slaughter, because for lack of horses the mission could not furnish them. For the same reason, lack of horses, no branding of cattle could take place in the past year.

"If it is not allowed to continue with this slaughter through the said men, who have a sufficient force of horses for this work, then most assuredly my credit and liability will be put in a bad light with those shipping merchants. If it cannot be done, I beseech Your Honor to please instruct me as to what means I must employ to pay the debts."

Another letter of the same July 2nd, 1834, and addressed to Gov-

ernor Figueroa, throws additional light on the subject. "I received your favor of the 20th of June," Fr. Oliva writes, "and at the same time I received an Order from the Illustrious Deputation to suspend the slaughter which is being done at this mission. Supposing, then, that this same order may be interpreted to permit the slaughter if a necessity is shown, I have to tell Your Honor that I am bound and pledged to the ships for the amount of $16,000, and I have no other means to satisfy this debt. This slaughter is carried on in an entirely orderly manner within the inclosure of the cattle, and only old and wild cattle are killed. I have made use of the two neighbors for the reason that this mission has not a sufficient number of horses to effect the slaughter. I hope you will permit the work to go on by means of the two men until the number is complete to redeem me."

It is pleasant to note that Governor Figueroa on July 8th consented to have the debt, which Fr. Oliva contracted for the benefit of the mission, paid in the way reported. ("Cal. Arch.," St. Pap. Missions, iv, 779, 785.) Doubtless the slaughter at San Gabriel found a similar explanation, though the reply of the missionary is not extant, and both were therefore entirely legitimate. At Purisima no unusual slaughter of cattle took place, nor at any other mission. Fathers Durán and García did not respond by letter; they protested against the calumnies in person, as will appear near the close. Hence the story peddled around by Guinn that California from one end to the other "was become a mighty shambles" is nothing but a mighty fiction. The whole affair again shows forth the wicked character of the covetous mission enemies, who stopped at nothing in order to find justification for their crimes against their helpless victims: the neophytes and missionaries.

Such, then, is the mole-hill out of which the greedy conspirators constructed a mountain, and succeeded in persuading thoughtless writers to picture the scrupulously conscientious friars as wilful destroyers of public property! This was not all. The enemies lied for effect; the wicked story therefore reached Mexico, and may have influenced legislators not a little. The following "Defence" which during 1836 appeared in one of the papers of the capital will make this clear. We do not know the author; but he must have been conversant with affairs in California. With it we close our lengthy disquisition.

"Editors of the 'Diario del Gobierno':

"My Dear Sirs:—In your esteemed paper of September 30th, 1836, I have seen the address which Colonel Mariano Chico made at the opening of the Departmental Legislature at Monterey, California." (This speech was made on May 27th, 1836. More about it in the next volume.) "Its contents have filled me with just indignation, because I see therein statements which are contrary to the

truth, and only tend to blacken the conduct of the missionaries. Señor Chico, who at the time was but a few days near those missions, could speak of their operations only on the strength of information received from some people who are there; unfortunately he fell into the hands of informants whose instructions made him assent to error and compromised his honor before an enlightened public. I, who have lived there a long time, during which I have been eye-witness to what occurred, and who know the inhabitants of that territory, think I may be believed, for I do not speak under the influence of guides who might lead into falsehood, as has happened to Don Chico. Let us take up the matter.

"Chico's mentors, among other falsehoods which occur in his speech, made him assert that the missionaries effected the most frightful slaughter of cattle, destroyed valuable vineyards, and in fine abandoned every kind of resources which would have enriched California. Is this really true, Colonel? Is Your Honor sure of what you affirm? You do not perhaps know, because your informants would not tell you, that the missionaries in some missions killed only the half-wild and unbranded cattle. Your Honor may not know that this was one of the calumnies by means of which the enemies endeavored to blacken the missionary religious from the time the innovations began, in order to have a pretext for driving the missionaries from the management of the property of the Indians. You may not be aware of the fact that the Superiors of the missionaries" (Fathers Durán and García Diego) "before Governor Figueroa protested against this lie, and that said governor was convinced of the falsity." (Hence Bancroft is in error when he asserts that the Fathers left in the records no denial of the truth of the charge, though really no denial was necessary.) "If perhaps Your Honor, on account of what has been told you, does not believe what we all saw, tell us at which mission the frightful slaughter of cattle took place. Which 'imprudently zealous friar' ordered it done? and if it was done at perhaps one mission, why are all the missionaries calumniated? Why attribute this 'imprudent zeal' to all?

"The same denial I must make with regard to the assertion that valuable vineyards were destroyed. On your life tell us, where were they destroyed? Which of the missionaries has done this? What I know is that the vineyards which existed for many years past still exist. Nor have I heard this lie told until now. I suspect that they have related to Don Chico that at San Luis Obispo in times past a vineyard was cleared of vines because it was found that it remained unproductive, inasmuch as the soil was unfavorable for grapes, and the mission did not want the land to be unused. Is it possible that on such feeble foundation all the missionaries should be inculpated? Rather say that the determination is to defame

the missionary religious. Rather say that the motive is the desire for the property of the Indians. Rather say pretexts are sought for eluding the law of November 7th." (This law, passed by the Mexican Congress on November 7th, 1835, revoked the confiscation decree of Figueroa and restored the missions to the friars. The subject will be ventilated in the next volume.) "Rather say that some of those who hold mission property resist surrendering it, because they know that they shall suffer hunger and need as they suffered before on account of their notorious lack of application to work. Rather say all this, but do not slander missionaries whose conduct has always been irreprehensible, and whose aims had no other object than the welfare and happiness of the Indians as well as of the white people.

"I have not expressed myself properly. I will speak correctly. The friars have been very criminal. They have abandoned their country, their parents, their brothers and sisters, their friends and relatives, solely for the sake of the missions. They have embraced a life full of privations and almost without society among a people by whom they are hardly understood and appreciated. They have endeavored to extricate these poor Indians from barbarism, and they have given them secular as well as religious instruction. They have supplied them with suitable teachers who give instructions in the arts that are beneficial to the whole territory. Indeed, those missionaries have made slaves of themselves. They have administered the Sacraments to all people in the towns as well as in distant ranchos anywhere. Yet they have never molested the settlers for fees or contributions on behalf of Divine Worship. They have been the consolation of the afflicted who obliged through misfortune arrived at their doors. They have been the refuge and relief of the travellers whom they sheltered, tenderly refreshed, and conducted to the next mission to be there received in the same way, and enjoy the like services of Christian charity. They cared for the Indians as a father cares for his beloved children. They defended them against the insults, injury, and ill-treatment which it was the fashion of the white people to inflict upon Indians. They looked after the property interests of their Indians as though they were their own. They fed them, clothed them, and attended them in sickness. They took great pains to keep the neophytes from intercourse with vicious white people in order to preserve them from corruption. In fine the missionaries have kept the neophytes orderly for more than sixty years, so much so that it could not be said that their wards are vagabonds who wander about stealing cattle for the purpose of sustaining their vices.

"These are the crimes which the missionaries of Upper California have committed; unpardonable crimes in the eyes of a certain class of individuals; and they are those that have aroused the persecu-

tion, vilification, and outrages which the friars suffer, and which embitter their existence. These, O Sacred Ministers! are your faults. May the Most High never permit you to repent of them, or to change your ways so as to receive the approbation of your enemies, the mentors of Don Chico. In spite of them, continue to protect the unhappy neophytes. Sacrifice yourselves for them by resuming charge of the missions which the Supreme Government, satisfied with your praiseworthy conduct, again entrusts to you." (The writer, whoever he may have been, presumed that the decree of Congress of November 7th, which annulled Figueroa's confiscation decree, would take effect. Unfortunately for the Indians, such was not the case. It was disregarded in California until little more than ruins were left, which some years later were delivered to the friars; but that story belongs to the next volume.) "I know very well that this will make you objects of the jealousy of some. I know that at some missions you will find yourselves in the midst of ruins, which you will have to build up as in the beginning, and it will be more difficult on account of the demoralization of the Indians; but rest assured that you are making a grand sacrifice for Religion, and that your country will recognize and appreciate your services. I promise myself as much from the wise and just Government which happily governs us. As for yourselves, if you see yourselves slandered in a distant land, know for your consolation that there are many who esteem your merit, and who will rise in defence of you, as I have done, and with better weapons than mine."

"A Lover of Truth and of the Missions of Upper California."

(Santa Barbara Archives.)

105797

Engelhardt
missions..v.3

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PRINTED IN U.S.A.